In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

Transcript
Dawrat al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’
(The Course on Loyalty and Disavowal)

By Sheikh Dr. Hānī al-Sibā‘ī

Al-Taḥāyā Foundation
Department of Transcription and Publishing

Adapted into English by Febby Angga
Proofread and reviewed by [….]

Transcription Methodology

We have slightly edited the speech without compromising the meaning, with the aim of presenting the material in a form suitable for study and reading as much as possible, through:

- Changing some colloquial words to standard Arabic words.
- Changing the phrasing of some sentences to comply with grammatical rules.
- Deleting some repetitive sentences.
- We did not review the Sheikh’s citations from the scholars, but we attempted to distinguish the texts as much as possible by placing them between quotation marks "..", noting that the Sheikh would sometimes mention texts by meaning (paraphrasing), and his explanatory phrases would sometimes mix with the phrases of those he was quoting.

The First Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We praise Him for all good; we thank Him and are not ungrateful to Him. We cast off and forsake those who disobey Him. O Allāh, You alone we worship, to You we pray and prostrate, and towards You we strive and hasten. We hope for Your mercy and fear Your punishment; surely, Your serious punishment will overtake the disbelievers. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Dear male and female students:

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

This is the first lecture of the Shariah course. The original title of this lecture is: "**Al-Walā' wa al-Barā' and its Relationship to Īmān (Faith)**". *In shā' Allāh*, this will be the first lecture, which will consist of an introduction and a presentation of the research methodology for this course. By the grace of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*, we will begin this course with this introduction in this first lecture. The introduction consists of: Why did we choose *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*? What is the relationship of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* to our contemporary reality? And the importance of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* or *Al-Muwālāh* (Alliance/Loyalty) and *Al-Mu'ādāh* (Enmity/Disavowal).

First: *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, in the simple and simplified concept, means love and hatred, *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* for the sake of Allāh. However, *In shā' Allāh*, we will address the definition in detail later. But this is the simplest form: love for the sake of Allāh and hatred for the sake of Allāh. Thus, *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* serve as the backbone of the Islamic creed (*'Aqīdah*). Just as the liver is a major organ in the human body, and as specialists say, it has more than five hundred functions, similarly, *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* has multiple and numerous functions.

It enters into all aspects of a Muslim's life based on the saying of Allāh the Exalted:

قُلْ إِنَّ صَلَاتِي وَنُسُكِي وَمَحْيَايَ وَمَمَاتِي لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ

"Say, 'Indeed, my prayer, my rites of sacrifice, my living and my dying are for Allah, Lord of the worlds.'" [QS. Al-An'ām: 162]

So, if your life, O Muslim, is for the Lord of the worlds, then it is incumbent upon you that your worship, your movements, your stillness, and your legislation be for the Lord of the worlds.

وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونِ

> "And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me." [QS. Al-Dhāriyāt: 56]

Therefore, *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* also have a close relationship that is inseparable from *Īmān* (Faith). For this reason, our methodology in this course, *In shā’ Allāh*, requires students to listen to the "Issues of Faith" (*Masā’il al-Īmān*) course, which consists of eleven lectures published on the Al-Maqrīzī website and on YouTube. You can download them easily. This is because the exam, *bi idhnillāh*, will cover these two areas: *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* (or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*) and *Masā’il al-Īmān*, given the implications resulting from applying certain rulings to the reality of Muslims, especially regarding the issue of a Muslim aiding disbelievers and enemies of the religion. Thus, the student is required to listen to this course, "Masā’il al-Īmān," to save time. This is a course I conducted years ago, so perhaps some young men can download it and help you, *In shā’ Allāh*, with the links. Or, if you search on YouTube or enter the Al-Maqrīzī website, you will find the complete course, *bi idhnillāh Ta‘ālā*.

Regarding the youth or students who have already been examined in the "Masā’il al-Īmān" course and also wish to obtain the certification (*Ijāzah*) or take the exam in this course: Yes, whoever succeeded in the "Masā’il al-Īmān" course separately, we will not ask them about the subject of issues of faith; the exam will be specific to *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* only. As for those who have not been examined, it will cover both subjects: *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* and *Masā’il al-Īmān*.

I must alert the students and the brothers and sisters listening to us now that the exam is on the fundamental issues. Sometimes I digress, go east and west, elaborate on certain issues, speak at length on a specific case, or discuss historical anecdotes; you will not be asked about these in the exam. So rejoice, because it might be said: "How will I be examined on all this vast information, and how will I memorize all of it?" No, we examine, *In shā’ Allāh*, on the important issues and the fundamental matters that any Muslim, any student of knowledge, should acquire. As for the extra issues, names, titles, historical items, such as "So-and-so was born on such a date and died in such a year," these are matters you will not be asked about, *In shā’ Allāh*. However, you will be asked about the main, fundamental,

important topics of the subject of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* and *Masā'il al-Īmān, In shā' Allāh*.

So, *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, as we said, serves as the backbone of the human body; it is the backbone of the body of the *Ummah*, the body of Islam. *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* also has a close relationship inseparable from *Īmān*. You will understand this well especially when we apply certain rulings and contextualizations to contemporary ok bjects and issues. We will address very important and thorny contemporary issues and calamities (*Nawāzil*), which require scrutiny, the application of the faculty of jurisprudence (*Fiqh*), the use of principles (*Uṣūl*), and many Shar'ī factors to regulate these issues, *In shā' Allāh*.

Al-Walā' wa al-Barā' is also related to love for the sake of Allāh and hatred for the sake of Allāh, and it is, as stated in the Ḥadīth, "The strongest handhold of faith." Unfortunately, this doctrine has eroded and almost vanished among many Muslims; regarding love for Allāh and hatred for Allāh, people now do not know how to define their enemy. Matters have become very mixed up.

Furthermore, *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* is related to the concept of the homeland and citizenship (*Al-Waṭan wa al-Muwāṭanah*), especially after the bond of loyalty to citizenship or the homeland has replaced the bond of loyalty to the religion. This issue is one of the most dangerous contemporary issues in terms of dilution among most Muslims, sadly. We have discussed this issue in our book *Dawr Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī fī Takhrīb al-Huwwiyyah al-Islāmiyyah* (The Role of Rifa'a al-Tahtawi in Destroying the Islamic Identity). Sheikh Rifā'ah Rāfi' al-Ṭahṭāwī, when Muḥammad 'Alī Bāshā sent him with a mission to learn some industries and things, was essentially a preacher to admonish them and lead them in prayer. Suddenly, he excelled, mastered French, translated French laws, and laid the first bricks for the edifice of secularism in the Islamic world. He was the one who sowed these first seeds of the plant of secularism by embellishing the appearances of France at that time. Therefore, he spoke about the concept of the homeland and citizenship.

Al-Ṭahṭāwī and those who followed his path began to manufacture a new religion named "The Homeland and Citizenship," and loyalty and singing praises of the homeland and citizenship, even if it was at the expense of the bond of religion. Naturally, controlling secularism snatched this up; because those who established and protected secularism were the Alawid family: the family of Muḥammad 'Alī Bāshā and his sons: Ibrāhīm Bāshā, Ismā'īl, Sa'īd, and Tawfīq, until we reached Fu'ād and Fārūq who

ruled Egypt. This family is the one that planted this malicious seedling in the Islamic world. The beginning of setting aside the Islamic Shari'ah was also during the reign of Khedive Sa‘īd. This might lead us, we spoke about it in the book *Dawr Rifā‘ah Rāfi‘ al-Ṭahṭāwī*, but what I mean here is the subject of substituting new concepts. This is what we are speaking about and mean now, because the concept of citizenship and the homeland became a process of minimization via Sykes-Picot, minimizing societies, minimizing states. It became: "This is Egyptian," "This is Algerian." The important thing is that they live on the same land and the same place, and religion does not matter. The important thing that gathers them is the land, or the language they speak, or the coexistence they live in one place. Therefore, it is possible for a specific state to wage war on other Muslims due to border issues sown and planted by this colonialism that ruined the Islamic world.

Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’ is also related to the concept of the enemy, defining the enemy, or what is termed the "Near Enemy" and the "Far Enemy." If we were, for example, facing two enemies: a near internal enemy and a far external enemy, which one is more deserving of confrontation? This is an issue we will highlight, *In shā’ Allāh*, especially since there are leaders of Islamic movements and many contemporary scholars who say: "We cooperate with the near enemy, ally with him, and remain silent about the disputes between us in exchange for facing the external enemy." This was used by the Nasserist media in the past, and used by totalitarian regimes deviating from the Shari'ah under the concept of "No voice rises above the voice of the battle." Naturally, these regimes snatched up this saying, and these oppressive, tyrannical regimes took this slogan as a pretext to suppress people and humiliate them under the claim of unifying the war effort against the enemy usurping Palestine.

The irony is that we discovered later that they are all friends and agents of the usurping enemy, and they are the ones who handed over Muslim lands as an easy morsel to the enemies of the *Ummah*. Those who handed Palestine to the Jews are those who raised the slogan "No voice rises above the voice of the battle." This usurping entity, Israel, defeated them several times, naturally with a global Crusader alliance, but these people are also the ones who neglected and sold Palestine and collaborated. They are the people who argue most that there is no freedom for people, no Shari'ah, no religion, no nothing; "Do not speak about these matters, the war effort must be unified." So Islamic lands like Iraq and Afghanistan were occupied before, and the list goes on because of these sayings and the failure to define the enemy: the internal enemy and the external enemy. The external enemy is obvious; the problem lies with the internal enemy. We

will highlight this point, because this issue has a core relationship to the subject of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*, whether the external enemy or the internal enemy. We will speak about the contemporary calamity if an enemy enters Muslim lands; here, the external and internal [enemies], and the descendants of Abū Righāl cooperate, for example, with the American occupier in Afghanistan, Iraq, and everywhere now. So what does this mean? It means that this issue requires attention, and, *In shā' Allāh*, we will draw attention to it later.

Regarding the subject of the importance of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, or the concept of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* and the study of this subject and its importance, this is what we discussed and dwelt upon in the previous points. After this introduction, our methodological plan will be, by the will of Allāh, through the following points:

- We will speak first about the most famous books written on the subject of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. This is one point.
- Then we will speak after that about the definition of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* linguistically and legally, as it is said, terminologically, and we will define the difference between *Al-Muwālāh* (Alliance) and *Al-Tawallī* (Turning to/Taking as allies), and some terms mentioned by the scholars.
- Then we will speak about the Shar'ī evidences for *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. There are more than twenty evidences mentioned by the scholar Sulaymān b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb and Imam Al-Kattānī Al-Maghribī.
- We will also speak after that in a point about forms of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* throughout history, and how the state of Islam collapsed and their Caliphate was lost.
- Also, contemporary issues related to *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*: We will speak about the ruling on the spy in Islam, and we will discuss, *In shā' Allāh*, the story of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*. The strange thing about the subject is that all conflicting and contrasting opinions use the story of Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah as evidence, and we will speak about this subject.
- We will also speak about an issue related to the subject of the ruling on the spy; we will speak about verifying the effective cause that necessitates takfīr (*Taḥqīq al-Manāṭ al-Mukaffir*) in the issue of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*; because there is confusion in this issue. Therefore, I indicated at the beginning that the student should utilize the "Masā'il al-Īmān" course, which is simplified and easy,

In shā' Allāh, because it will benefit us in such issues. So, verifying the effective cause that necessitates takfīr in the issue of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, the reason for the dilution came from this *Manāṭ* (effective cause), from verifying this *Manāṭ*; the dilution itself came from here.

- We will also speak about an issue related to *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* and the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* as well, which is one of the modern calamities (*Nawāzil*): the issue of Citizenship (*Al-Jinsiyyah*) and naturalization with the citizenship of another state, meaning naturalization in a state of disbelievers, especially in our present time, or citizenship in general. We will speak on this subject.

- We will also speak about subsidiary issues related to the concept of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, such as some doubts (*Shubuhāt*) related to the difference between coercion (*Ikrāh*) and precaution/dissimulation (*Taqiyyah*) and their relationship to *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. We will also refute some doubts regarding the issue of marriage to a woman of the People of the Book (*Kitābiyyah*), Jewish or Christian. Marriage is known to mean affection and love, so how do we combine *Al-Walā'*, which is love for the sake of Allāh, with the love of a *Kitābiyyah* wife while she is not upon Islam? We will discuss this issue as well. Also, the subject of the doubt regarding affection for disbelieving parents, and affection for the People of the Book who are not warring, not fighting, and not inciting against the believers at all; how do we show them affection while at the same time affection (*Mawaddah*) can only be for the sake of Allāh and they are disbelievers? There are subsidiary issues, doubts related to the difference between *Al-Mudārah* (diplomacy/gentleness), *Al-Mudāhanah* (compromise/flattery), and *Al-Muwālāh*. We will discuss some of these definitions, *In shā' Allāh*.

- Also, among the issues we will discuss in this course and highlight, we will conclude with the evils (corruptions) of allying with disbelievers, or the consequences of aiding disbelievers. We will speak about these evils, *In shā' Allāh*, at the conclusion of this course.

However, we will start today with the definition of the first issue. Today, we will discuss only as an introduction, defining the most famous books written on the subject of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*. Naturally, we might be asked now: What are the most famous

books? What is the most famous book that spoke about *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*? It is, of course, the Holy Quran; the Holy Quran is among the clearest, this issue, the issue of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* or *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, is among the clearest and brightest issues. This is a clear, evident matter in the Holy Quran despite the disturbance raised by some biased individuals who dilute this issue, despite its clarity in more than twenty verses of the Holy Quran. We will review some of these verses, *In shā' Allāh*, when we speak about the issue of Shar'ī evidences.

In addition to commentaries in books of Tafsīr (Exegesis) regarding these verses and the sayings of the scholars, there are also books of Ḥadīth, the *Ṣiḥāḥ* (authentic collections), and the commentaries of Ḥadīth scholars on these books. This is a reference and a pure spring for these concepts, meaning the concept of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, or the chapter of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*, we will find it evident and clear in the Holy Quran and in the noble Prophetic Sunnah.

I will, of course, review the books according to chronology (seniority). This is the method of scientific research, O youth, when you present a research plan, you select and review the issues you will speak about, the methodology you will deal with in your research and use, and then you speak about a sample of the books you relied upon in your research. Here, we are pursuing a scholarly approach with you. Therefore, some might say: "Why do you speak about the books? Mention them in the references at the end."

No, this is the scientific method I see appropriate to prepare the minds that this knowledge is not an innovation, and that this science or concept of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* and *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* is not something scholars haven't spoken about before; rather, they have spoken about it, by the grace of Allāh, and there are many treatises and books on this subject.

For example, we spoke about the Holy Quran and we spoke about the *Ṣiḥāḥ* books and also the Ḥadīths. Among the ancient books is one by Al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, the great scholar who died in the year 544 AH. He has a book, *Al-Shifā'*. This book, *Al-Shifā'*, is among the respected, good books in which he defended the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and explained and spoke about the characteristics of the Chosen One (*Al-Muṣṭafā*) and his rights, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*. It is a valuable book with good issues, and it has many commentaries. Even Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah relied on it greatly in his book *Iqtiḍā' al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* and the book *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* and others. Many scholars took from Al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ and relied on his rulings and on his book *Al-Shifā'*.

There is another book which is a pillar (*‘Umdah*) on this subject, and it is related to the subject of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* and *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*, and also related to the issue of external appearance/guidance (*Al-Hady al-Ẓāhir*), in detail. It is a book of utmost magnificence by Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, titled: *Iqtiḍā’ al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm fī Mukhālafat Ahl al-Jaḥīm* (The Requirement of the Straight Path in Contradicting the People of Hellfire). This is a very valuable book, and one of the pillars in the issues of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*.

Ibn Taymiyyah also has a book *Al-Furqān bayna Awliyā’ al-Raḥmān wa Awliyā’ al-Shayṭān* (The Criterion between the Allies of the Most Merciful and the Allies of Satan). This book is on the subject of alliance and enmity, the allies of Satan, and the allies of the Most Merciful; this is at the core of what we are speaking about. He also has a book related to this subject but related to the issue of disparaging the Messenger, insulting him, and violating his sanctity, which is an issue also related to the issue of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*, in his enjoyable, large, great book: *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl ‘alā Shātim al-Rasūl* (The Drawn Sword against the Insulter of the Messenger) by Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. This book is a large book. It is Ibn Taymiyyah's method that he digresses greatly and enters and reviews many issues that you sometimes think are peripheral, but this is the enjoyment of Ibn Taymiyyah and the enjoyment of his writings. One of the students of his students, who was a contemporary of Ibn Taymiyyah but the preponderant opinion is that he did not take directly from him, he took from the great Imām Ibn al-Qayyim and the students of Ibn Taymiyyah directly, is the Imām Al-Ba‘lī Al-Ḥanbalī, who summarized the book *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl*. It is a beautiful and easy summary for those who want to read it; it is by Imām Al-Ba‘lī Al-Ḥanbalī.

Also, a book related to this subject is the book *Aḥkām Ahl al-Dhimmah* (Rulings of the People of Protection/Dhimmah) by Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Qayyim, who died in the year 751 AH. With a caveat on an issue: there are some editors who edited this book, but because they, unfortunately, were influenced by the contemporary reality and defeatism before the biased propaganda against Islam, you find them speaking and providing opinions contrary to the opinions of Ibn al-Qayyim, and they try to justify things that Ibn al-Qayyim has nothing to do with. Therefore, we advise not to pay attention to the opinions of those who edited the book *Aḥkām Ahl al-Dhimmah*, such as Dr. Ṣubḥī Ṣāliḥ and others who edited it. Frankly, their editing is generally good regarding the book (text), but their opinions, unfortunately, cannot be relied upon. Pay attention to the original text only; read the text and care for it. *Aḥkām Ahl al-Dhimmah* by Ibn al-Qayyim is related to the subject of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’*. It does not speak about the

story of the *Ahl al-Dhimmah*, but because it relates to the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*, the inner circle (*Biṭānah*), governance, and relations with those who live with us on our internal front and inside the Islamic world specifically. So this is a valuable book by Ibn al-Qayyim, which is *Aḥkām Ahl al-Dhimmah*.

There is also a treatise, or a small booklet, titled *Al-Dalā'il fī Ḥukm Muwālāt Ahl al-Ishrāk* (The Evidences Regarding the Ruling of Allying with the People of Polytheism). This is a small booklet by the Sheikh, the young scholar, the martyr, we consider him so and do not sanctify anyone above Allāh, Sulaymān b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb. He was born in the year 1200 AH and died in the year 1233 AH. He is the grandson of Sheikh Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb. Naturally, he did not coincide with him to listen and take from his grandfather, because his grandfather died six years after his birth; in 1206 AH, Sheikh al-Islām Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, who is the author's grandfather, died.

This scholar, although he lived a short period, was killed as a martyr, *raḥimahullāh*, while he was thirty-three years old. The scholar Al-Shawkānī, author of *Nayl al-Awṭār*, had granted him authorization (*Ijāzah*) in his narrations and books. This scholar, the young erudite, the Uṣūlī (scholar of principles), the author of beneficial books, has a very majestic book titled: *Taysīr al-'Azīz al-Ḥamīd Sharḥ Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*. This book is valuable and among the best books that explained *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* by Sheikh al-Islām Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb.

This book was summarized by the scholar, also from this same school, Sheikh 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥasan in his famous book titled: *Fatḥ al-Majīd*. However, the story of this man is that he was killed. How was he killed? The tyrant of Egypt at that time, the son of Muḥammad 'Alī Bāshā: Ibrāhīm Bāshā, killed him. This Ibrāhīm Bāshā was Egyptian, and at that time Muḥammad 'Alī Bāshā ruled Egypt and the Levant (*Shām*), and the state was very strong. He wanted to serve the Ottomans, who were in a state of collapse and deterioration at that time.

Unfortunately, they incited him, and he entered to eliminate the call (*Da'wah*) of Sheikh Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb and his grandsons and children, and this call which rejected Shirk and graves and wanted the return of Muslims to the pure spring and to the Pious Predecessors (*Salaf Ṣāliḥ*), and to reliance on the Quran and Sunnah, and so on, to cleanse the Islamic society of these grave-worshippers and people of Shirk. So the Egyptian armies entered under the leadership of Ibrāhīm Bāshā, and they entered Al-Dir'iyyah. This was a beacon for knowledge and scholars, and was truly a capital of knowledge at that time. They turned it into a barren

plain. They besieged them, and they had very strong weapons. Naturally, Ibrāhīm Bāshā was threatening the major powers and had a very strong, immense army. This army was able to defeat these poor people and besieged them, possessing very strong cannons. He destroyed Al-Dir‘iyyah completely. Those who surrendered surrendered and were besieged, and they gave people safety later, after this great massacre.

However, Ibrāhīm Bāshā and some biased, hateful individuals who detested this call, the call of Tawḥīd, incited him to kill the Sheikh, the author, meaning the author of the treatise *Al-Dalā’il fī Ḥukm Muwālāt Ahl al-Ishrāk*, who is Sheikh Sulaymān b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb. So they brought him. Ibrāhīm Bāshā knew that Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, along with the scholars of the Wahhabi call at that time, forbade listening to musical instruments, songs, and music. So they used to bring musical instruments, play, sing, and chant to spite them and provoke these scholars. They placed Sheikh Sulaymān, this young man, since they said "This is their leader and this is their sheikh, and he is one of the sheikhs of this family", they placed him in a graveyard called the Al-Dir‘iyyah graveyard there. They placed him there in the graveyard, and he ordered his soldiers to aim their rifles at him. They tore his body apart completely, collected his flesh in a bag/sack, and buried him or threw him away. They cut him into pieces, may the vast mercy of Allāh be upon him, the author of these beneficial books. It is a very simple and very small book; we can call it a booklet. It is *Al-Dalā’il fī Ḥukm Muwālāt Ahl al-Ishrāk.*

Although he was speaking about the issue of the People of Polytheism (*Ahl al-Ishrāk*) at that time, speaking about the story of grave-worshippers and polytheists, the origin of the evidences he uses applies to all People of Polytheism, whether grave Shirk, Shirk of obedience, Shirk of rulers; all of this applies.

There is also a treatise by the same Sheikh Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb *raḥimahullāh* titled *Awthaq ‘Urā al-Īmān* (The Strongest Handholds of Faith). There is also another treatise *Awthaq ‘Urā al-Īmān* by Sheikh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, as I told you, Sheikh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb died in the year 1206 AH, and he was born in 1115 AH. These treatises are simple treatises, all collected in the book *Majmū‘at al-Tawḥīd li-‘Ulamā’ al-Da‘wah al-Najdiyyah* (The Collection of Tawḥīd by the Scholars of the Najdi Call). You can find most of these treatises in the *Majmū‘at al-Tawḥīd* books.

There is also a treatise from this same school, which is the treatise *Sabīl al-Najāh wa al-Fikāk min Muwālāt al-Murtaddīn wa Ahl al-Ishrāk* (The Path of Salvation and Liberation from Allying with Apostates and

People of Polytheism). This treatise follows the same approach, the approach of Sheikh Sulaymān b. ʻAbd al-Wahhāb and those preceding him. It is a nice treatise by the scholar Sheikh Ḥamad b. ʻAlī b. ʻAtīq. Sheikh Ibn ʻAtīq was born in the year 1227 AH and died in the year 1301 AH. This scholar was among the beauties of time, and was stern regarding the truth. He was also a contemporary of the scholar of India, Sheikh Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān, the author of books and author of *Fatḥ al-Bayān fī Maqāṣid al-Qur'ān* and *Fatḥ al-ʻAllām fī Sharḥ Bulūgh al-Marām min Adillat al-Aḥkām*. He has beneficial, beautiful books. This man, *mā shā' Allāh*, was called an "Amir" because he married a princess in India. He was wealthy and rich, so Allāh blessed his knowledge and the books he printed. He printed many beneficial books and authored books that benefited the people of India at that time, and the Arab Muslims benefited from them, including Sheikh Ḥamad b. ʻAtīq. There is a nice correspondence indicating immense politeness, utmost politeness, beauty, and humility as well. Sheikh Muḥammad [Ḥamad] b. ʻAtīq had reached seventy years of age, and he comments in a correspondence between him and Sheikh Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān, telling him some Sharʻī observations on his Tafsīr *Fatḥ al-Bayān*. It is a beautiful correspondence indicating the etiquette of scholars among themselves, and that scholars benefited from one another. So, this beautiful treatise by this great scholar is *Sabīl al-Najāh wa al-Fikāk min Muwālāt al-Murtaddīn wa Ahl al-Ishrāk*.

Naturally, there is another book, which appeared later in this era, all of this is among the scholars of the East (*Mashriq*) now; strictly speaking, Al-Qāḍī ʻIyāḍ from ancient times is from the scholars of the West (*Maghrib*), but we are speaking now in the East. There is a book titled *Al-Dawāhī al-Mudhiyyah fī al-Firaq al-Maḥmiyyah fī al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* (The Calamitous Disasters regarding the Protected Sects in Loyalty and Disavowal) by the scholar of the Maghrib, Sheikh al-Jamāʻah, he used to be titled thus as Sheikh al-Jamāʻah, which is a term equivalent to Sheikh al-Islām in the East; meaning Sheikh al-Jamāʻah in the Maghrib is almost the same term as Sheikh al-Islām, who is Sheikh Abū al-Mawāhib Jaʻfar b. Idrīs al-Kattānī al-Ḥasanī, born in the year 1246 AH and died in the year 1323 AH. This scholar is the father of the scholar Muḥammad b. Jaʻfar al-Kattānī, who died in the year 1346 AH, the author of the beautiful, interesting book: *Al-Risālah al-Mustaṭrifah li-Bayān Mashhūr Kutub al-Sunnah al-Musharrafah*. This scholar, Al-Kattānī, his four sons are among the senior scholars of the Maghrib, as well as his grandsons who edited his books, especially his book which I pointed to: *Al-Dawāhī al-Mudhiyyah*. It is a scholarly family, *mā shā' Allāh*. In this book, he spoke about the evidences of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, refuting some doubts, spoke about some contemporary issues, spoke about the Spanish and French

occupation, and spoke about the effects of aiding polytheists. It is a beneficial, enjoyable book relied upon in such matters, and it is among the pillar books in issues of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’*.

Among the contemporary modern books is the book *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’ fī al-Islām* by Dr. Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd al-Qaḥṭānī. It is in one volume, and several editions of it have been printed. It is among the books that have great acceptance. This book was originally a master's thesis from Umm Al-Qura University in Mecca, defended in the year 1401 AH. It is a good book, and its division is good, beneficial, and very easy, and he spoke on contemporary issues.

There is another book in the same era; the book *Al-Muwālāh wa al-Mu‘ādāh fī al-Sharī‘ah al-Islāmiyyah* by Dr. Miḥmās b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Jal‘ūd. It is printed in two volumes, the edition I have now is the edition of the year 1407 AH / 1987 CE. This book, unfortunately, is not printed now, but it is a book very close to the book *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’ fī al-Islām* by Dr. Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd al-Qaḥṭānī, although in *Al-Muwālāh wa al-Mu‘ādāh* he discussed issues and spoke on more matters, but the book could have been collected in one volume rather than two volumes; because he used to speak at length on issues and historical stories which all serve the entirety, but it could have been collected in one volume. There are some categorizations by some writers, for them and others, which we will discuss, because there are some issues, slight lapses, in the two books, but in general, they are among the best contemporary books in this chapter.

There is also a book by the scholar, may Allāh have mercy on him, Bakr Abū Zayd, the book *Al-Ibṭāl li-Naẓariyyat al-Khalṭ bayna al-Islām wa Ghayrihi min al-Adyān* (The Nullification of the Theory of Mixing Islam with Other Religions). It is a book in the same context as *Al-Muwālāh wa al-Mu‘ādāh* and *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’*. It is a contemporary book and is considered not a large-sized book.

There are some treatises such as the treatise *Tuḥfat al-Ikhwān limā Jā’a fī al-Muwālāh wa al-Ḥubb wa al-Bughḍ wa al-Hijrān* by the scholar Sheikh Ḥumūd b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Tuwayjirī.

There are also treatises like the treatise *Al-Ḥubb fī Allāh wa al-Bughḍ fī Allāh* by Sheikh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Āl ‘Abd al-Laṭīf.

Naturally, there are many books; among them are commentaries on *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* by Sheikh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, the fatwas of the Permanent Committee (*Hay’at Kibār al-‘Ulamā’*), the book *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah*, very many books that spoke on the origin of this subject. In

addition to a book like "The Chapter of Rulings on the People of Apostasy" in the book *Al-Mughnī,* in the eighth volume approximately, according to the edition, in the modern edition of *Al-Mughnī* edited by ʻAbd Allāh b. Muḥsin al-Turkī, which is among the best editions currently; there is the old original Dār al-Turāth edition, but in any case, the Book of Rulings on Apostasy found, or the Book of Apostasy found in almost all books of Fiqh, the Book of Apostasy and the rulings of the apostate, you will find in it issues related to the controls of Takfīr and expressions, and you will find things also related to *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* and these issues in detail.

There are also books that can be relied upon, including the book of the scholar Badr al-Rashīd al-Ḥanafī, which is the book *Alfāẓ al-Kufr* (Expressions of Disbelief), meaning those by which a Muslim becomes a disbeliever.

There is a famous, printed, and easy book as well, which is the book *Al-Iʻlām bi Qawāṭiʻ al-Islām* (The Notification regarding the Nullifiers of Islam) by the scholar Aḥmad b. Ḥajar al-Haythamī al-Shāfiʻī.

And the book *Risālah fī Alfāẓ al-Kufr* by Qāsim b. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and others.

And the book *Risālah fī Alfāẓ al-Kufr* by Abū al-Maʻālī Masʻūd b. Aḥmad al-Ḥanafī.

These books are also all printed, of course, I pointed to these books in the "Masā'il al-Īmān" course, and spoke about them because we needed to speak about them at that time. These books are used for assistance because they are related to the issue of Takfīr, and the controls of Takfīr; because they are issues related to the issue of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā',* related to disbelief (*Kufr*) and faith (*Īmān*). It is not a recreational issue, nor is it as if you are studying the subject of grammar or a subject in literature or poetry! This issue of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* and *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Muʻādāh* is an issue from the core of belief (*Iʻtiqād*). This issue is related to Īmān, related to Kufr, related to who is the believer, who is the disbeliever, your relationship to these levels in *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Muʻādāh,* meaning allying with disbelievers, or allying even with people of innovation (*Bidʻah*), allying with people of sin, and disavowing the people of Kufr, disavowing the people of sin, and disavowing the people of innovation.

All these are issues of utmost danger. Therefore, they also require studying books related to the controls of Takfīr, and the controls related to applying these rulings, and this is what we will delve into, as I told you before, regarding the subject of verifying the effective cause that

necessitates takfīr (*Taḥqīq al-Manāṭ al-Mukaffir*) for the chapter of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’*, and we will also discuss the issue of Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah, *In shā’ Allāh*.

These are the books generally that we will rely upon, *In shā’ Allāh*. For any student of knowledge who wants to rely [on sources], these are the basic books. There are complementary books for the contemporary background, especially in this contemporary world of ours, very important political books. We will choose a simple sample of these books, for example, the book *Ḥuṣūnuna Muhaddadah min Dākhilihā* (Our Fortresses are Threatened from Within) by Dr. Muḥammad Muḥammad Ḥusayn *raḥimahullāh*. He has another book titled *Al-Ittijāhāt al-Waṭaniyyah fī al-Adab al-Mu‘āṣir* (Nationalist Trends in Contemporary Literature). The serious student of knowledge who wants to understand such issues should read these two books; *Ḥuṣūnuna Muhaddadah min Dākhilihā*, in which he spoke about the root of the ailment, and about this existing disease. He spoke about nationalist trends in contemporary literature, and spoke about issues and exposed the callers of nationalism and Westernization, and those who mouth off about the homeland and patriotism. For everyone who authored on the homeland, patriotism, and contemporary literature and spoke about these issues regarding Westernization and others, they are dependents on the books of Dr. Muḥammad Muḥammad Ḥusayn.

There is another book written long ago, coinciding with the visit of Sheikh Abū al-Ḥasan al-Nadwī to Egypt long ago, *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi*. He has a book among the beneficial and enjoyable books: *Mādhā Khasira al-‘Ālam bi Inḥiṭāṭ al-Muslimīn?* (What Did the World Lose by the Decline of Muslims?). This book has been printed in several languages and several editions. The book has been in print for over sixty years. It speaks about the Islamic world, which was occupied at that time. Whoever reads it now would think that this book is by a contemporary writer, because it speaks about the problem, the ailment, and how loss and ruin befell the world due to the decline of Muslims.

There is also a book by the Counselor Dr. ‘Alī Jarīshah *raḥimahullāh*, *Asālīb al-Ghazw al-Fikrī* (Methods of Intellectual Invasion).

And a book by Sheikh ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥabannakah al-Maydānī; he has a beautiful and valuable book, and this book is a huge volume, according to the edition I have now, which is *Ajniḥat al-Makr al-Thalāthah wa Khawāfīhā* (The Three Wings of Deception and Their Coverts). This is a very valuable book.

There is also a book by the poor slave [of Allāh], myself, titled *Dawr Rifā‘ah al-Ṭahṭāwī fī Takhrīb al-Huwwiyyah al-Islāmiyyah*. I have

referred to this book previously regarding the concept of citizenship and nationalism.

Also, among the beneficial books that are concerned with these issues are the books of the scholar, the *Muḥaddith* of the Egyptian lands, Sheikh Aḥmad Shākir *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* and his brother, the scholar, the linguist, the investigator (*Muḥaqqiq*), Sheikh Maḥmūd Shākir *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*. His books are very, very beneficial and useful, whether in his book *Al-Ḥākimiyyah* or other beneficial books on this subject, as well as the treatises they wrote on this subject.

These books, I tell you, are supplementary; books you will not be examined on, of course. I am recounting to you this methodology that we will rely upon. However, I will not ask you, for example, "Who is the author of such-and-such book?" or "What is the death date of So-and-so?" No, this issue is only to prepare the student to evoke the greatness of this knowledge, and to evoke the status of this course and the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*. This is what we will speak about, *In shā' Allāh*.

Naturally, today I will conclude with a simple historical overview of the state of the *Ummah* and from where the defect came in the issue of the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* or *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*.

Of course, Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr in *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* and in his *Tafsīr* spoke and pointed to this issue, and I will speak about it in the Shar'ī evidences as well, but what concerns me here is the issue of purity in the first centuries; the creedal purity.

Ibn Kathīr diagnosed the state of the *Ummah* for us after the first centuries, saying: "And such was the matter when the three centuries, who are the best of this *Ummah*, were in the utmost rectitude and establishing obedience to Allāh the Exalted; they remained victorious over their enemy, conquests were numerous, and enemies were in degradation and loss. Then, when tribulations (*Fitan*), desires, intermingling, and differences occurred between the kings, the enemies coveted the outskirts of the lands and advanced towards them. They were not repelled because the kings were busy with one another. Then they advanced to the heartland of Islam and took many countries from the outskirts. Then they continued until they seized many of the lands of Islam, and to Allāh belongs the command before and after. So, whenever a king from the kings of Islam stood up, obeyed the commands of Allāh, and relied upon Allāh, Allāh granted him victory over lands and he reclaimed from the enemies according to his capacity and the extent of his *Wilāyah* (loyalty/devotion) to Allāh. And Allāh is the One asked and hoped to empower the Muslims over the

forelocks of His disbelieving enemies, and to elevate their word in all regions; verily He is Magnanimous, Generous."

Thus, Ibn Kathīr speaks about an issue: that purity was prevalent at that time, the Creed (*‘Aqīdah*) was clear, and the *Ummah* was in a single cohesion from the creedal aspect. When differences appeared among them, the enemies of the *Ummah* coveted them, took some lands, and seized these opportunities. However, we say this continued, but we consider the dividing line in this dilution and the beginning of the defect to be in the era of Caliph Al-Ma’mūn. This is because Caliph Al-Ma’mūn at that time, Caliph Al-Ma’mūn is the son of Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd, but Al-Ma’mūn was raised upon a creedal deviation because he was influenced by the Zaydī Shī‘ah. What happened between him and his brother occurred, until the year 218 AH, shortly before Caliph Al-Ma’mūn's death, when he brought near the judge Ibn Abī Du’ād who initiated these tribulations and trials regarding the issue of the creation of the Quran. The state then adopted the thought of the Mu‘tazilah, and they restricted the scholars of the Salaf and the scholars of the Sunnah at that time. They tested them, and killed those they killed. It was a great, sad epic at that time, which began at the end of the reign of Caliph Al-Ma’mūn.

In his era, they also began what is called "Translation"; because he brought near to his court these scholars from the Persians and others from the Romans (Byzantines). They translated for him the books of the Greek philosophers, and also translated some ancient books from the Indians and the Chinese. He opened a library called "The Library of Wisdom" (*Maktabat al-Ḥikmah*), and brought all these books that destroyed and caused this ruin later, which are the books of the philosophers. People became occupied with these translations, and what is called "Philosophers of Islam" appeared to us. The creedal ruin happened here.

Occupations and schools of skepticism arose even in the Creed, even in issues at the core of belief. Scholars were influenced by the ideas of the Mu‘tazilah. The Ash‘arīs, who stood to refute the Mu‘tazilah, were themselves influenced by the Mu‘tazilah in the method of phrasing books of creeds in which you find no light; a dark method, contrary to finding the Book of Allāh clear, and finding the Prophetic Sunnah clear. When you read the book *Al-Sharī‘ah* by Imām Al-Ājurrī, you find it clear, and he was in the fourth Hijri century. You find these books were beautiful and clear, and the books of Imām Al-Bukhārī and others, and the Sheikhs of Imām Al-Bukhārī, and I referred to all these books in the "Issues of Faith" (*Masā’il al-Īmān*) course.

But the point here is that the deviation began with the era of Al-Ma'mūn and those who followed him, until Caliph Al-Mutawakkil came and restored status to the *Ahl al-Sunnah*. However, the tear had become too wide for the patcher (*ittasa'a al-kharq 'alā al-rāqi'*), as it is said, and these innovations (*Bida'*) had spread.

Therefore, we find among some orientalists who wrote a book about Islamic civilization, Adam Mez, when he chose the peak of civilization among Muslims and the greatest eras among Muslims, he considered the peak of maturity to be the fourth Hijri century. Even though the beginning of decline, fragmentation, and tearing apart was in the fourth Hijri century: the appearance of innovations, the appearance of the Qaramita (*Qarāmiṭah*), the appearance of the 'Ubaydī state before that of course, the fragmentation of the *Ummah*, the appearance of all those called atheists (*Malāḥidah*), and the books written at that time. The state of the people of innovation became strong in this era, and the Islamic world was occupied in this century as well. So the fourth century was a century for the ascendancy of the people of innovation and for the division and fragmentation of the *Ummah*, yet he says it is the beginning of the era of scientific renaissance, maturity, and philosophy! Because the books of philosophers appeared at that time.

So this is the beginning of dilution and creedal ruin. People began to speak, and people no longer relied on the pure clarity from the books of Creed, from the Holy Quran and the Sunnah, or even from the authentic books of *Ahl al-Sunnah* at that time. Instead, people relied on the books of philosophers and wise men and their argumentation; the ruin came from here.

This matter depended on the extent of the *Sunni-ness* and knowledge of the Caliph. If the Caliph was a Sunni, a scholar, loved the Sunnah, and loved the People of Ḥadīth (*Ahl al-Ḥadīth*), the state in his era would be strong and have power (*Shawkah*) over the people of innovation. If the knowledge of the Caliph and the ministers after him was weak... if the Caliph was weak, his ministers from the people of innovation would raise their heads and control the destinies of Muslims. This is what I will review with historical evidences regarding how Muslim lands fell throughout history due to the creedal defect, and bringing near those whom they took as an inner circle (*Biṭānah*) to the exclusion of the believers. This is at the core of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, and at the core of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*: that you bring near the believers and distance the disbelievers, bring near the people of righteousness and distance the people of sin and the people of innovation. However, the opposite happened, so the collapse that we have reached occurred.

What we are living through even now is a result and fruit of the fruits of this dilution and deviation in holding fast and adhering to the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* since the fourth Hijri century. I consider it from the third century as well, from the days of Caliph Al-Ma’mūn, but the issues widened and increased powerfully since this fourth Hijri century, and the appearance of the people of innovation. Even very many deviations occurred in hijacking the term "Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah," so the Ash‘arīs began calling themselves Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah because they were refuting some sects like the Rawāfiḍ and the Shī‘ah, and were refuting the Mu‘tazilah, and were refuting other sects like the Karrāmiyyah and others.

But in the end, the common people were confused and no longer knew the true methodology of Ahl al-Sunnah. Then the scholars of Ḥadīth appeared and held fast to this and refuted, but authority and power were in the hands of those people. Therefore, the concept of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* was diluted and this deviation appeared.

Although, in fairness to the truth, the Ash‘arīs, despite the innovations, and the Ash‘arīs, of course, have divisions; some are extremists, and some are intermediate, but by all measures, despite that, they have writings of utmost strength in defending this religion. They have very strong writings on issues of Kufr and Īmān. For instance, Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī, despite his Ash‘arism, and he is closer to grave-veneration (*Qubūriyyah*) as well, despite that, he has the book *Al-I‘lām bi Qawāṭi‘ al-Islām* which is of utmost strength and severity in issues of Kufr and Īmān, rulings on apostasy, and these expressions. Would that the contemporary Ash‘arīs be like them at least in this chapter!

However, in any case, *In shā’ Allāh*, we will scrutinize all these issues in the next lecture, which is the second lecture. We will begin it, *bi idhnillāh Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā*, with the definition of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* linguistically and terminologically, and we will speak on the difference between *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*, then after that, we will speak about the Shar‘ī evidences for *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* according to the issues we will address.

I say this statement of mine and ask Allāh for forgiveness for me and for you.

Al-salāmu ‘alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Second Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We praise Him for all good; we thank Him and are not ungrateful to Him. We cast off and forsake those who disobey Him. O Allāh, You alone we worship, to You we pray and prostrate, and towards You we strive and hasten. We hope for Your mercy and fear Your punishment; surely, Your serious punishment will overtake the disbelievers. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Dear male and female students:

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

Here we are with the second lecture of the *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* lectures. *In shā' Allāh*, today we will speak about the definition of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* linguistically and terminologically, then after that, we will review with you the Shar'ī evidences from the Book and the Sunnah.

We remind you that we spoke in the first lecture about our methodology in this Shariah course. We spoke about: Why we chose *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, the relationship of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* and the importance of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* in our contemporary reality. We also reviewed samples of the books and references written on this subject with a very simple historical overview. *In shā' Allāh*, this will occur later in the application of the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* or *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* through our review of samples from ancient and contemporary history later, *In shā' Allāh*.

I remind you that the subject of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* or *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* is of great importance. It is not a luxury or merely a literary subject studied as such, or a cultural course. Rather, this concept is as Sheikh Ḥamad b. 'Atīq *raḥimahullāh* said: "As for enmity towards the disbelievers and polytheists, know that Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* has obligated that, emphasized its obligation, forbidden allying with them, and was severe regarding it, to the extent that there is no ruling in the Book of Allāh containing more evidences nor clearer than this ruling, after the obligation of *Tawḥīd* and the prohibition of its opposite. Allāh the Exalted said: 'And when it is said to them, "Do not cause corruption on the earth," they say, "We are but reformers."'"

He means the meaning of this verse as Ibn Kathīr said on this subject: "For among corruption on the earth is the believers taking

disbelievers as allies, as the Exalted said: 'And those who disbelieved are allies of one another. If you do not do so, there will be fitnah on earth and great corruption.' So severing alliance between believers and disbelievers [is obligated], as Allāh the Exalted said: 'O you who have believed, do not take the disbelievers as allies instead of the believers.'"

This is what we will review later, *In shā' Allāh*, from the evidences. But I wanted to enter through this entrance, which is emphasizing that *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* is a divine command, and that enmity towards disbelievers and polytheists is among the most obligatory of obligations after *Tawḥīd*.

Definition of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* Linguistically:

You will find in Arabic language dictionaries that the meanings are close, and there is a quasi-consensus among linguists on close definitions for the issue of *Al-Walā'*. Almost no one deviated in this.

The one who collected these definitions for several meanings in *Lisān al-'Arab* is the scholar Ibn Manẓūr. When he quoted from Ibn al-A'rābī the meaning of *Al-Muwālāh*, he said: "That two people quarrel, and a third enters between them for reconciliation, but he has a desire (bias) towards one of them, so he allies with him (*yuwālīhi*) or favors him." So *Al-Muwālāh* came from here; three or two people quarreling and one enters between them but inclines, has a bias, loves this person so he inclines towards him, thus allying with him or favoring him. "Therefore: So-and-so allied with So-and-so (*wālā fulān fulānan*) if he loved him."

However, among the Arabs in the Arabic language, you will find that this noun "Al-Walī" or "Al-Mawlā" encompasses several meanings. It may be applied to the Lord (*Al-Rabb*), for He is our *Mawlā*. It is applied to the Owner, the Master (*Sayyid*), the Benefactor, the Manumitter, the Helper (*Nāṣir*), and the Lover (*Muḥibb*). It is also applied to the Follower, the Neighbor, the Cousin among the Arabs, the Ally (*Ḥalīf*), and it is applied to the In-law. It is also applied to the Slave, "this is my *mawlā*" meaning my slave, and Allāh is our *Mawlā* meaning our Master. It is also applied to the Emancipated slave and the Beneficiary.

But these names, as Ibn Manẓūr says: their sources differ. Sometimes people say: *Al-Walāyah* with the opening (fatḥah) on the Wāw, and sometimes they say *Al-Wilāyah*. So *Al-Walāyah* with the fatḥah is in lineage, support, and manumission. *Al-Wilāyah* with the kasrah means he gave him *Wilāyah*, meaning an emirate/governorship. *Al-Walā'* is in manumission. *Al-Muwālāh* is from *waliya al-qawm* (he was close to the people/governed them). Some said: *Al-Walī* is the friend, the helper. *Al-*

Walī is the lover. All these meanings you will find revolving around meanings of **Proximity** (*Qurb*). This is from the linguistic aspect.

Also, *Al-Muwālāh* is the opposite of *Al-Mu'ādāh* (Enmity), and *Al-Walī* is the opposite of *Al-'Aduww* (Enemy). *Tawallāhu* means he took him as a *Walī*. But among all these, the word *Al-Walī* indicates nearness and closeness as well. This is in the definition of *Al-Walī* or *Al-Mawlā*. So they all revolve around the meaning of the lover, the helper, the follower, proximity, nearness. These are the close meanings in the Arabic language. Big words: The Lord, the Master, the Owner, the Benefactor, the Manumitter, the Helper, the Lover, the Follower, the Ally; all of these.

As for **Al-Barā'**, as Ibn Fāris said in his book *Maqāyīs al-Lughah*, he says: "*Al-Barā'* means distancing from a thing and separating from it (*muzāyalatuhu*). From that is *Al-Bur'* which is safety from illness. *Bari'tu* and *bara'tu*. From that is their saying: *Bari'tu ilayka min ḥaqqika* (I am clear to you of your right/claim). The people of Hejaz say: *Innā burā' minkum* (We are clear/disassociated from you), and others say: *Anā barī' minka*. So this means distancing and separation, and it means safety from disease."

Therefore, Al-Rāghib al-Aṣfahānī said in *Mufradāt Alfāẓ al-Qur'ān al-Karīm*: "The origin of *Al-Bur'* and *Al-Barā'ah*: distancing oneself from what one dislikes being near to. Therefore it is said: *bara'tu* (I recovered) from the illness, and *bari'tu* (I disassociated) from So-and-so and *tabarra'tu* from him, and *abra'tuhu* (I absolved him) from such-and-such, and *barra'tuhu*. And a man is *barī'* (innocent/free), and people are *burā'*." All of this indicates distancing oneself from what one dislikes being near to, or it means separation, distance, and aversion to this person or this thing.

Therefore, when Ibn Manẓūr quoted in *Lisān al-'Arab* from Ibn al-A'rābī also: "*Bari'a* if he got rid of, and *bari'a* if he kept aloof and distanced himself, and *bari'a* if he excused and warned, as in His saying, Exalted is He, in Sūrat Barā'ah (Al-Tawbah): 'Disassociation from Allah and His Messenger.' [QS. Al-Tawbah: 1] Meaning an excuse and a warning from Allāh and His Messenger. Therefore, even Arabs say: 'This is the night of *Al-Barā'*.' The night of *Al-Barā'* among the Arabs refers to when the moon disassociates from the sun, gets rid of it, and distances itself from it."

Al-Zabīdī said in *Tāj al-'Arūs*: "The origin of the composition of *Al-Bur'* is for the purity/freedom of a thing from another", because you free/purify something from another, "either by way of safety/recovery: like the recovery (*bur'*) of the sick from his sickness, and the debtor from his

debt. Or creation (*inshā'*): like Allāh creating (*bara'a*) Adam from clay," He extracted him and created him from clay.

So it means that you extract something from something, and distance something from something, or it is an excuse, and it also conveys the meaning of distancing.

The summary of this: *Al-Walā'* linguistically applies to several meanings. We only use this to benefit from language dictionaries, but we restrict it to the following:

Al-Walā' applies to several meanings: among them love, support, following, proximity to a thing, and nearness to it.

Al-Barā' applies to several meanings as well, among them: distance, keeping aloof, getting rid of, and enmity.

These are the meanings of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* linguistically.

The Second Point, Definition of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* Legally:

Scholars have defined *Al-Walā'* with many definitions, among them, all of them are also close to the original linguistic meaning in the Arabic language among Arabs, so in the Shar‘ī terminological meaning: *Al-Walāyah*. If we say *Al-Walāyah* or *Al-Wilāyah*, some scholars do not differentiate between *Al-Walāyah* and *Al-Wilāyah* from the Shar‘ī aspect.

Al-Walāyah: It is support, love, honoring, respect, and being with the beloved ones outwardly and inwardly. The Exalted said:

اللَّهُ وَلِيُّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا يُخْرِجُهُم مِّنَ الظُّلُمَاتِ إِلَى النُّورِ وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا أَوْلِيَاؤُهُمُ الطَّاغُوتُ يُخْرِجُونَهُم مِّنَ النُّورِ إِلَى الظُّلُمَاتِ

> "Allah is the ally of those who believe. He brings them out from darknesses into the light. And those who disbelieve - their allies are Taghut. They take them out of the light into darknesses." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 257]

So, allying with disbelievers means drawing near to them, and showing affection to them through words, deeds, and intentions. Allāh is the Ally (*Walī*) of those who believe, He brings them out from darknesses into the light; so He is their Helper, He is their Beloved, and He is closer to them, for they are in His alliance. As for the disbelievers, their allies are *Taghut*, they bring them out from the light into darknesses; because they are their allies, their beloveds, their helpers, and the people of affection for them.

The meaning of this is that allying with disbelievers means: drawing near to them and showing affection to them through words, deeds, and intentions. *Al-Walāyah* is also support, love, honoring, and respect with the beloved ones outwardly and inwardly.

Al-Barā': It is distance, freedom/severance, and enmity after excusing and warning.

Therefore, Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in his book *Al-Furqān bayna Awliyā' al-Raḥmān wa Awliyā' al-Shayṭān* gave a comprehensive statement in defining *Al-Walāyah* from the Shar'ī aspect. He said: "*Al-Walāyah* is the opposite of *Al-'Adāwah* (Enmity). The origin of *Al-Walāyah* is love and proximity. The origin of *Al-'Adāwah*, meaning *Al-Barā'*, is hatred and distance. It was said that the *Walī* was named *Walī* due to his *Muwālāh* (continuity/following) of acts of obedience, meaning his following of them. The first is more correct, meaning love, proximity, and support. The *Walī* is the Close One (*Al-Qarīb*). It is said: 'This follows/is next to (*yalī*) this,' meaning it is near to it. So if the *Walī* of Allāh is the one who agrees with Him and follows Him in what He loves and is pleased with, and hates and is displeased with, and commands and forbids, [then] the one who shows enmity to His *Walī* has shown enmity to Him. As the Exalted said: 'Do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies, extending to them affection.' [QS. Al-Mumtaḥanah: 1] So whoever shows enmity to the allies of Allāh has shown enmity to Him, and whoever shows enmity to Him has waged war against Him. Therefore, it came in the Ḥadīth: 'Whoever shows enmity to a *Walī* of Mine, has challenged Me with war.'"

So, the one who shows enmity to the *Walī* of Allāh is showing enmity to Allāh and warring against Him. He is challenging Allāh with enmity and war; "Then be informed of a war from Allāh" [referencing QS. Al-Baqarah: 279]. Because the allies of Allāh, who are the helpers of Allāh, are those who love Allāh, they are the close ones; this is the meaning.

Therefore, Sheikh 'Abd al-Laṭīf b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān said in his book *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah fī al-Ajwibah al-Najdiyyah*, and unfortunately, this book has now become banned from entering book fairs at the level of Arab countries, even in the Land of the Two Holy Mosques. Some said this book must not be printed again. It is a book of several volumes by the scholars of the Najdi Call. Unfortunately, some responded to this. It is among the best and greatest books that spoke on Apostasy and *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, and spoke on the rulings of Kufr and Īmān, and many other things by the scholars of the Najdi Call, and the treatises published by Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, and by Sheikh al-Islām Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb

and his sons and grandsons and the scholars of the Najdi Call in general. It is a very valuable book.

Sheikh ‘Abd al-Laṭīf b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān said: "The origin of *Al-Muwālāh* is love, and the origin of *Al-Mu‘ādāh* is hatred. From them arise actions of the hearts and limbs that enter into the reality of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*, such as support, intimacy, assistance, and such as Jihad, Hijrah (migration), and similar actions. The *Walī* is the opposite of the enemy."

Does the heart have an action? People think that the heart believes/verifies faith, in the definition of faith. Of course, I refer whoever wants to know the details to the "Issues of Faith" (*Masā’il al-Īmān*) course because it is very important in this subject, and I spoke about it in detail in the "Issues of Faith" course as I told you, in eleven lectures.

But I say here: Actions of the hearts, yes. The heart has an action. Is there anyone who can mention to me any action among the actions of the hearts? Contentment, fear, intimacy, love, hatred; all these are actions among the actions of the hearts denied by the Jahmiyyah and the sects of innovation who restricted faith to verification (*Taṣdīq*) only, claiming the heart has no relation to actions. No, the heart has an action; fear, hope, love, contentment, tranquility, all these are named "actions of the hearts," just as the limbs have actions, as we pray, fast, and perform ablution; these are actions of the limbs.

Also, Sheikh ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-‘Anqarī said: "*Al-Muwālāh* is agreement, support, assistance, and contentment with the actions of those he allies with. This is the General *Muwālāh* which, if it emanates from a Muslim towards a disbeliever, the doer is considered a disbeliever", meaning the General *Walāyah* which is called Absolute *Walāyah*. "As for mere gathering with disbelievers without complete manifestation of the religion, along with hatred for their disbelief, it is a sin that does not necessitate Kufr." This is in *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah*. We will review this subject later, but the point here is: *Al-Muwālāh* is agreement, support, assistance, and contentment with the actions of those he allies with.

There is also among people the term *Al-Tawallī* and *Al-Muwālāh*. We will differentiate between *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Tawallī, In shā’ Allāh*; because the word *Tawallā* and *Yatawallā* is from the root of *Al-Walā’* as well. However, *Al-Tawallī* may come with two different meanings. It can mean turning away (*I‘rāḍ*), and it can mean following (*Ittibā‘*). The Exalted said:

وَإِن تَوَلَّوْا يَسْتَبْدِلْ قَوْمًا غَيْرَكُمْ

"And if you turn away, He will replace you with another people." [QS. Muḥammad: 38]

Meaning if you turn away from Islam. *Tawallā* meaning turned away.

And it may come meaning following, as in His saying, Exalted is He, in [Sūrah Al-Mā’idah]:

وَمَن يَتَوَلَّهُم مِّنكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْهُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ

"And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 51]

Meaning whoever follows them and supports them.

So *Tawallā* means turned away, and *Tawallā* means followed. Therefore, when we say: "This one took the disbelievers as allies (*tawallā al-kuffār*)," this is the dispute that arose among scholars regarding the difference between *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Tawallī*. Sometimes some scholars use the word *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Tawallī* synonymously; they do not differentiate. Others divide them, saying: This is an Absolute, Complete *Muwālāh*, and whoever allies with the disbelievers with Absolute *Muwālāh*, this is a disbeliever outside the fold of the religion (*Millah*). Meaning he loves them, supports them, incites them, and does everything; this is named Absolute *Muwālāh*, which is also *Al-Tawallī* according to scholars; because *Al-Tawallī* is absolute following, absolute support. It is the same meaning as the word Absolute *Muwālāh*.

But scholars divided *Al-Muwālāh* into sections: A section meaning Absolute *Muwālāh*, which is Kufr that expels from the Millah. And Minor *Muwālāh*, which does not expel from the Millah. This is the difference between the two.

As for *Al-Tawallī*, it is one saying among them; there is no Major and Minor *Tawallī*. *Al-Tawallī* is complete turning/alliance. Therefore, Sheikh ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Laṭīf said: "*Al-Tawallī* is Kufr that expels from the Millah, and it is like defending them, and aiding them with money, body, and opinion. And *Al-Muwālāh* is a major sin among the major sins, like wetting the inkwell, or sharpening the pen, or smiling at them, or raising the voice for them." He differentiates here regarding *Al-Muwālāh* meaning Minor *Muwālāh*. But if it is said *Al-Muwālāh* is Kufr expelling from the Millah, they mean it in the sense of *Al-Tawallī*, meaning that you

follow with absolute following, absolute proximity, absolute love, absolute assistance with money and body, and contentment and aiding them against the believers. All this is called Complete *Tawallī*, so it is named Complete *Muwālāh*.

As for the section where scholars differed and spoke about, which is considered a major sin not expelling from the Millah, they mean Minor *Muwālāh*.

So, lest anyone be confused by this mix-up, we try to divide it simply:

- **Absolute General *Muwālāh*:** This is explicit Kufr, and it is synonymous with *Al-Tawallī*. Therefore, the evidences speaking about the severe prohibition of allying with disbelievers and that whoever allies with them has disbelieved, exited the Millah, refer to this: Absolute *Muwālāh*, i.e., *Al-Tawallī*, because there is no minor and major *Tawallī*; it is only *Al-Muwālāh* [that is divided], because *Al-Tawallī* is complete following.
- **Minor *Muwālāh* ("Specific *Muwālāh*"):** It is allying with disbelievers, as they said, for a worldly purpose along with the safety of belief (*I‘tiqād*) and without harboring the intention of Kufr and Apostasy. As happened with the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* in divulging the secret of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* in the invasion of Mecca. *In shā’ Allāh*, we will speak on this subject when we speak about the ruling on the spy, and speak about the effective cause that necessitates takfīr (*Al-Manāṭ al-Mukaffir*) in the chapter of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*, or *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’*.

So, Absolute General *Muwālāh* is synonymous with the meaning of *Al-Tawallī*, and with this description, it is Kufr and Apostasy. When it is in this meaning. Whatever is below that depends on the intention of the doer, the subject, the intent, and other things. This is regarding Minor *Muwālāh*. As for *Al-Tawallī*, it is a single opinion (one category).

Sheikh ‘Abd al-Laṭīf b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Āl al-Sheikh said: "The name *Al-Muwālāh* applies to varying branches. Among them is what necessitates Apostasy due to the complete departure of Islam, and among them is what is below that of major sins and prohibitions."

So the name *Al-Muwālāh* for the enemies of Allāh applies to varying branches; not every *Muwālāh* means exiting the Millah and the complete departure of Islam. Among it is what is below that of major sins and prohibitions. He says: "And since Allāh established brotherhood, love,

Muwālāh, and support between the believers, and forbade allying with all disbelievers, including Jews, Christians, atheists, polytheists, and others, it became among the principles agreed upon among Muslims that every monotheist believer who abandons all Shar'ī nullifiers [of faith], his love, alliance, and support are obligatory. And whoever is contrary to that, it is obligatory to draw near to Allāh by hating him, showing enmity to him, and striving against him with the tongue and the hand according to ability and possibility."

Because *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* are subordinate to Love for the sake of Allāh and Hatred for the sake of Allāh. The basis of Faith is to love for Allāh and hate for Allāh; to love for Allāh His Prophets and their followers, and to hate for Allāh His enemies and the enemies of His Messengers. As Sheikh 'Abd al-Laṭīf Āl al-Sheikh says: And a Ḥadīth was narrated from Ibn 'Abbās: "Whoever loves for the sake of Allāh, hates for the sake of Allāh, allies for the sake of Allāh, and shows enmity for the sake of Allāh, then indeed the *Wilāyah* (guardianship/friendship) of Allāh is attained only by that. And a slave will not find the taste of Faith, even if his prayers and fasting are many, until he is like that."

Therefore, the general fraternization of people, unfortunately, in these days has become based on worldly matters. This is what the Ink of the Ummah (*Ḥabr al-Ummah*) Ibn 'Abbās *raḍiyallāhu 'anhumā* speaks about: that the fraternization of people in his time had become based on worldly matters, and that was the best of centuries. So what about our century, and what about our time in which we live!

Some scholars, as I told you, do not differentiate; sometimes they say: "This is *Tawallī*," meaning Major *Muwālāh*, and sometimes they say: "This is *Muwālāh*," without dividing, meaning *Al-Tawallī* as well.

As for the division of Minor *Muwālāh*, which is for a worldly purpose or sitting with them while his belief is safe and without harboring the intention of Kufr, because if he harbored the intention of Kufr he would disbelieve fundamentally, these are the conditions and constraints, and we will speak about them in the *Manāṭ* (basis/cause) of Takfīr later, *In shā' Allāh*.

The Shar'ī Evidences:

The Shar'ī Evidences, as I told you, are more than twenty evidences. Very many evidences from the Quran are clear. This arrangement [I am using]: I choose verses as an entrance; this is the first verse, and so on. Because you might find in some books they use another verse, or use it and start with it. There is no contention in that and no harm

in that. I start with what I personally see fit to start with: this verse as an entrance, then we enter the verses; because they are many verses and all of them are strong and explicit regarding the issue of Shar‘ī evidences on the subject of the prohibition of allying with disbelievers and the obligation of enmity towards them.

Allāh the Exalted says:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا بِطَانَةً مِّن دُونِكُمْ لَا يَأْلُونَكُمْ خَبَالًا وَدُّوا مَا عَنِتُّمْ قَدْ بَدَتِ الْبَغْضَاءُ مِنْ أَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَمَا تُخْفِي صُدُورُهُمْ أَكْبَرُ قَدْ بَيَّنَّا لَكُمُ الْآيَاتِ إِن كُنتُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ

"O you who have believed, do not take as intimates those other than yourselves [i.e., believers], for they will not spare you [any] ruin. They wish you would have hardship. Hatred has already appeared from their mouths, and what their breasts conceal is greater. We have certainly made clear to you the signs, if you will use reason." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 118]

This great verse is spoken about, interpreted, and explained to us by the scholar, the Sheikh of Exegetes (*Sheikh al-Mufassirīn*) Ibn Jarīr, who died in the year 310 AH. He says: "He, the Exalted, means by that: O you who have believed Allāh and His Messenger and affirmed what their Prophet brought them from their Lord, do not take a *biṭānah* from other than yourselves; meaning do not take allies and friends for yourselves from other than yourselves, meaning from other than the people of your religion and your creed, meaning from non-believers."

And I say: "Do not take a *biṭānah*." What is the meaning of *biṭānah*? *Biṭānah* means in the language: The garment that is directly next to the body. The Arabs took it from this, meaning that which is next to the belly (*baṭn*). Therefore, they took it from *baṭn*, so they consider it adhering to the human belly and skin, as we say the "undershirt" or "inner clothes" that adhere to the body. Why? Because the closest thing to a human is these inner clothes adhering to his belly and skin. Therefore, they called it *biṭānah* from here. Thus we say, for example, the lining (*biṭānah*) of the jacket, the lining of the cloak (*jubbah*), meaning this inner thing, because it is close to the human body.

Therefore, look at this magnificent simile "And who is more truthful than Allāh in statement" when He said: "Do not take a *biṭānah* from other than yourselves." He considered that whoever brings these disbelievers and people of misguidance near brings them near to him as if

they became adhering to him like that which follows his garment. So he is like the man who admits someone into his house, so he views his secrets. He is *biṭānah*, meaning close to him, so he views his secrets. And these "will not spare you [any] ruin. They wish you would have hardship." They wish for you to fall into evil, ruin, distress, and hardship. "They wish you would have hardship. Hatred has already appeared..." Meaning any hardship; they wish hardship for you, they wish destruction for you. And although he is close and you have brought him near to you, and he is like the lining of the garment to you, directly next to the body, so he is aware of your secrets and your nakedness (*'awrah*).

Therefore, Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* clarified that those whom you bring near reveal your secrets and wish for your misguidance and destruction. "Hatred has already appeared from their mouths." Sometimes they utter words, as some disbelievers do: "We are better than them," "Our civilization is better than their civilization," as Berlusconi said. This tyrant is essentially a Mafia thief; he said thus: "These Muslims are a burden on us and our civilization is better than their civilization." Then after that, he draws near again to some rulers who represent Muslims and says: "No, we cooperate with you, we do not mean this Islam, we mean something else." "And what their breasts conceal is greater!"

George Bush's slip when he said: "This is a Crusade." They said: "He does not mean it, it is a slip of the tongue." "And what their breasts conceal is greater!" There are boiling pots inside them. Therefore, when Pope Benedict XVI said: "The religion of Islam is a religion of violence," he said, "I was giving a lecture," even though he was inciting violence, saying "I was conveying something!" Thus, what their breasts conceal is greater. So Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* says: "We have certainly made clear to you the signs, if you will use reason." Allāh clarified to us and forbade us "Do not take a *biṭānah* from other than yourselves", a prohibition. Despite that, people take these as friends, close associates, and drinking companions, even though they are the ones who deceive them, mislead them, seek calamities for them, and seek to betray them. And Allāh warned us against mixing with them and bringing them near to us.

Therefore, Imām Al-Qurṭubī, and he also lived through the tragedy of Andalusia before coming to Egypt, Imām Al-Qurṭubī, when he applied this verse to his era while he was in the seventh Hijri century, because he died in the year 671 AH, comments on the verse saying: "Conditions have been overturned in these times by taking the People of the Book as scribes and trustees, and they became masters by that over the ignorant fools among the governors and princes. Al-Bukhārī narrated from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī from the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* who said: 'Allāh

never sent a prophet nor appointed a caliph but that he had two entourages (*biṭānatān*): an entourage commanding him with good and urging him upon it, and an entourage commanding him with evil and urging him upon it. And the protected one is he whom Allāh protects.'" End of Al-Qurṭubī's words on this when he was commenting on the verse in Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān 118.

I say that Al-Qurṭubī was speaking these words about the seventh Hijri century, saying: "Conditions have been overturned in these times!" Although in the seventh Hijri century Islam was still strong, we do not compare it, of course, to the first centuries, but at that time there were states and petty states ruling by the Sharī‘ah and religion. There were Sultans ruling at that time, the Mamluks and others. The easts and wests of the earth were not devoid of Islamic provinces despite their division. As for today, there is absolutely none. I claim that there is absolutely no state on the face of the earth ruling by the Law of Allāh, no authority ruling by the Law of Allāh. Even the projects that existed like the Taliban state in Afghanistan, naturally, they destroyed it; this is the only project I know of.

As for other than that, they are merely projects of distortions, incomplete projects, projects of establishing a state. Sometimes, by way of... The only state cited as an example of applying Islamic Shari'ah is the state of Āl Sa‘ūd! And the government is called the Saudi State, although we know that they are among the people most allied with the enemies of Allāh, and among the people most disavowing and showing enmity to the allies of Allāh. The prisons of Al-Ḥā’ir, and in Al-Rub‘ Al-Khālī (Empty Quarter), and the prisons of the monotheists (*Muwaḥḥidīn*), and usury, and other things. Everything you can imagine of legislations. They only use the establishment of *Ḥudūd* (punishments) to throw dust in the eyes, against the poor, for example, Filipino Muslims or Vietnamese or poor workers from Egypt and other Arab countries only. But have they ever established the *Ḥadd* on any American or Western European? This has never happened in their history at all. Whoever has a single proof, let him tell us.

In this era of ours, we are destined to live the humiliation and breathe the brokenness of our *Ummah* at the hands of this treacherous *biṭānah*. This is an explicit Quranic warning against taking a *biṭānah* from other than the believers, keeping our secrets with them lest the enemies of the *Ummah* view them or be shown them, especially if this *biṭānah* is within the circle of governance and among those close to the ruler and people of influence, along with our conviction that these rulers themselves are the head of treachery. The counselor or the *biṭānah* to the king or the president or the prince is merely a group of ambassadors: the state ambassador, and some Americans, English, and French. Even in Egypt, those who were

supervising the curricula of what is called "Development of Education", and this is approximately since this deposed Mubarak took over, this period called "Development" consisted of a delegate called the High Commissioner in every ministry; five Americans, and some French and English, especially Americans, were supervising what is called "developing", meaning "destroying", education curricula in Egypt over very many years, and it was public, not hidden.

So this is the *biṭānah*: *biṭānah* in governance, *biṭānah* in education, *biṭānah* in economy, *biṭānah* in everything. They destroy the identity of the *Ummah* through allying with these people. This is "They took them as allies," meaning helpers for them, they brought them near, and it is from the meaning of *Al-Walī* as well, and they distanced the sincere ones, the people of trust, and the people of righteousness; rather, they fought them. So this is the practical application of this. Thus, this is the first verse.

The Second Verse: The saying of Allāh the Exalted:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا عَدُوِّي وَعَدُوَّكُمْ أَوْلِيَاءَ تُلْقُونَ إِلَيْهِم بِالْمَوَدَّةِ وَقَدْ كَفَرُوا بِمَا جَاءَكُم مِّنَ الْحَقِّ يُخْرِجُونَ الرَّسُولَ وَإِيَّاكُمْ ۙ أَن تُؤْمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ رَبِّكُمْ إِن كُنتُمْ خَرَجْتُمْ جِهَادًا فِي سَبِيلِي وَابْتِغَاءَ مَرْضَاتِي ۚ تُسِرُّونَ إِلَيْهِم بِالْمَوَدَّةِ وَأَنَا أَعْلَمُ بِمَا أَخْفَيْتُمْ وَمَا أَعْلَنتُمْ ۚ وَمَن يَفْعَلْهُ مِنكُمْ فَقَدْ ضَلَّ سَوَاءَ السَّبِيلِ

"O you who have believed, do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies, extending to them affection while they have disbelieved in what came to you of the truth, having driven out the Prophet and yourselves [only] because you believe in Allah, your Lord. If you have come out for jihad in My cause and seeking means to My approval, [take them not as friends]. You confide to them affection, but I am most knowing of what you have concealed and what you have declared. And whoever does it among you has certainly strayed from the soundness of the way." [QS. Al-Mumtaḥanah: 1]

We say *Al-Mumtaḥanah* with the fatḥah, and we also say *Al-Mumtaḥinah*.

This verse is a pillar among the pillars of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. The reason for the revelation of this verse and the verses after it is the story of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah, and we will speak about this later in detail, *In shā' Allāh*. But the point here from the verse only, as the scholar

Al-Sa‘dī said in his Tafsīr: "Many exegetes, may Allāh have mercy on them, mentioned that the reason for the revelation of these noble verses is regarding the story of Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah when the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* undertook the invasion of the Conquest [of Mecca]. Ḥāṭib wrote to Quraysh informing them of the march of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* to establish a favor with them, not out of doubt or hypocrisy. He sent it with a woman. The Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* was informed of his affair, so he sent for the woman before her arrival and took the letter from her. He admonished Ḥāṭib, who offered an excuse, *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu*, which the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* accepted."

The point from these verses, as the scholar Al-Sa‘dī says: "These verses contain a severe prohibition against allying with the disbelievers among the polytheists and others, and extending affection to them, and [stating] that this contradicts Faith, and opposes the Millah of Abraham the Friend (*Khalīl*), upon him be blessings and peace";

إِنَّا بُرَآءُ مِنكُمْ وَمِمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ كَفَرْنَا بِكُمْ وَبَدَا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمُ الْعَدَاوَةُ وَالْبَغْضَاءُ أَبَدًا

> "Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from whatever you worship other than Allah. We have denied you, and there has appeared between us and you animosity and hatred forever." [QS. Al-Mumtaḥanah: 4]

He means this, this is the pure Hanifiyyah Millah of Abraham.

"And [it is] opposed to the Millah of Abraham the Friend, upon him be blessings and peace, and contradictory to reason which necessitates caution, every caution, against the enemy who spares no effort in enmity and seizes the opportunity to inflict harm on his enemy. So the Exalted said: O you who have believed, act according to the requirement of your faith by allying with those who establish faith, and showing enmity to those who show enmity to it, for he is an enemy of Allāh and an enemy of the believers. So do not take the enemy of Allāh and your enemy as allies, extending to them affection, meaning rushing into affection for them, and striving for its causes. For if affection occurs, support follows it."

If I hold affection for someone, I will support him, ally with him, and demonstrate with him, so I become a follower of him and close to him.

"So if affection occurs, support and alliance follow it, thus the slave exits from Faith, and becomes among the totality of the people of Disbelief, and separates from the people of Faith."

Al-Sa'dī also says: "And this person who takes the disbeliever as an ally also lacks chivalry (*Murū'ah*) —meaning he has no chivalry; you are neither a man nor do you have chivalry, neither religion nor chivalry!— for how can he ally with his worst enemy who wants nothing but evil for him? And oppose his Lord and his Ally who wants good for him, commands him with it, and urges him upon it?!"

A rhetorical question.

"And what also calls the believer to enmity towards disbelievers is that they have disbelieved in what came to the believers of the truth. There is no greater opposition and defiance than this, for they have disbelieved in the foundation of your religion, and claimed that you are misguided and not upon guidance, while the situation is that they disbelieved in the truth about which there is no doubt or uncertainty. Whoever rejects the truth, it is impossible to find a proof or argument indicating the correctness of his statement; rather, mere knowledge of the truth indicates the invalidity and corruption of the statement of the one who rejects it. And among their intense enmity, in the verse, is that they drive out the Messenger and you, meaning O believers, from your lands, from among you yourselves, and displace you from your homelands. You have no sin in that with them except that you believe in Allāh your Lord, whose worship is incumbent upon all creation; because He raised them and bestowed upon them apparent and hidden blessings, and He is Allāh the Exalted. So when they turned away from this command which is the most obligatory of obligations, and you undertook it, they showed enmity to you and drove you out because of it from your lands. So what religion, what chivalry, and what reason remains with the slave if he allies with the disbelievers whose description is this in every time or place?! And nothing prevents them from it [harming you] except fear or a strong barrier." End quote.

So these words mean that he possesses neither religion, nor chivalry, nor reason; one who shows enmity to the foundation of your religion!

And this is what happens. Those who say "We gather in what is called the Assembly of Religions or Interfaith Dialogue," they fundamentally do not recognize you as a religion. They do not recognize Islam at all. They consider Islam heresy. Whether in the Catholic Church, Orthodox, or Protestant, they all say there is no religion named Islam at all. They deal with us by the system of reality only, like this, but they do not

recognize Islam. They recognize each other, even though they declare each other disbelievers as well; that they have a foundation of religion. Meaning the Orthodox declare Catholics disbelievers, Catholics declare Orthodox disbelievers, and Protestants declare everyone disbelievers. But they all unite against Muslims in that they do not recognize their religion. How can he be a man who fundamentally does not recognize the foundation of your religion, does not recognize that there is a religion named Islam?! He considers it heresy! And considers that these are inventions by the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and the Arabs are the ones who invented it. Then after that you discuss with him saying "Interfaith Dialogue"! Okay, make him recognize your religion [first]. He does not recognize that you have a religion at all. So this is the problem with these people.

Then why do you draw near to them? And bring them near, why? Neither beneficial religion nor beneficial world, nor chivalry, nor reason, nor anything! They insult your Prophet, mock the Quran, and mock even the Lord of Glory, yet despite that, you fawn over them and draw near to them?! This is the calamity of calamities and a grave danger.

Therefore, he also says regarding the saying of the Exalted in the same verse from Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah: "If you have come out for jihad in My cause and seeking means to My approval": "Meaning if your intent in your exit is Jihad in the path of Allāh to elevate the word of Allāh and seeking the pleasure of Allāh, then act according to the requirement of this, by allying with the allies of Allāh and showing enmity to His enemies. For this is Jihad in His path, and it is among the greatest things by which those drawing near draw near to their Lord and seek His pleasure." And His saying, Exalted is He, in the verse also: "You confide to them affection, but I am most knowing of what you have concealed and what you have declared." "Meaning how do you confide affection to the disbelievers and hide it, while knowing that Allāh is Knowing of what you conceal and what you declare?!" A rhetorical question as the scholar Al-Sa‘dī mentioned regarding that.

"So even if it is hidden from the believers, it is not hidden from Allāh the Exalted. He will recompense the slaves for what He knows of them of good and evil. 'And whoever does it among you', alliance is an action; the action is allying with the disbelievers after Allāh warned you against it. What is his share? What is his description? 'Has certainly strayed from the soundness of the way,' because he tread a path contrary to the Sharī‘ah, reason, chivalry, and even humanity," as the scholar Al-Sa‘dī says.

Therefore, Sheikh Sulaymān b. ʻAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʻAbd al-Wahhāb *raḥmatullāhi ʻalayhi* also said commenting on this verse: "The Exalted informed that whoever allies with the enemies of Allāh, even if they are relatives, has strayed from the soundness of the way, meaning he missed the Straight Path and exited from it into misguidance."

Then he asks saying: "So where is this for the one who claims he is on the Straight Path regarding the one who did not exit from it?! For this is belying Allāh, and whoever belies Allāh is a disbeliever. And it is declaring lawful what Allāh has forbidden of allying with disbelievers, and whoever declares a prohibition lawful is a disbeliever. Then the Exalted mentioned the doubt (*Shubhah*) of those who excused themselves by wombs (relatives) and children", he means in the verse also in the same Surah, verse number three of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah, "The Exalted said: 'Never will your relatives or your children benefit you on the Day of Resurrection. He will judge between you. And Allah, of what you do, is Seeing.' [QS. Al-Mumtaḥanah: 3]"

Meaning those who excused themselves and said "We ally with our relatives," because they confide to them and give them the secrets of the believers and Muslims and divulge this. So He says "Never will they benefit you", a warning against the action, "Never will your relatives or your children benefit you on the Day of Resurrection. He will judge between you. And Allah, of what you do, is Seeing."

"So Allāh the Exalted did not excuse those who excused themselves by relatives and children and fear for them, and the hardship of separating from them. Rather, He informed that they will not benefit on the Day of Resurrection, nor avail against the punishment of Allāh at all, as the Exalted said in Sūrah Al-Mu'minūn: 'So when the Horn is blown, no relationships will there be among them that Day, nor will they ask about one another.' [QS. Al-Mu'minūn: 101]"

Of course, we dwelt upon this verse as an entrance also among the entrances of Shar'ī evidences, and this verse we spoke about is the verse of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah.

We also review another verse, which is the third verse in Sūrah Al-Mā'idah, the saying of the Exalted:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا الْيَهُودَ وَالنَّصَارَىٰ أَوْلِيَاءَ ۘ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلِيَاءُ بَعْضٍ ۚ وَمَن يَتَوَلَّهُم مِّنكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْهُمْ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ

> "O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 51]

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr says: "He, Blessed and Exalted, forbids His believing slaves from allying with the Jews and Christians, who are the enemies of Islam and its people, may Allāh fight them. Then He informed that they are allies of one another. Then He threatened and warned whoever commits that, saying: 'And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them.'" Then he cited with his chain of narration: "Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, so-and-so told us..." and he cited with his chain to Simāk b. Ḥarb from ‘Iyāḍ: "That Umar ordered Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī to report to him what he took and what he gave in a single leather skin. He had a Christian scribe, so he reported that to him. Umar was amazed and said: 'This is indeed a preserver. Can you read a letter for us in the mosque that came from Shām?' He said: 'He cannot.' Umar said: 'Is he impure?' He said: 'No, rather he is a Christian.' He said: 'So he scolded me and struck my thigh, then said: Expel him. Then he recited: "O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies..." the verse.'" Then he said: "Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan told us from Muḥammad b. al-Ṣabbāḥ..." then he cited with his chain from Muḥammad b. Sīrīn who said: "‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Utbah said: Let one of you fear being a Jew or a Christian while he perceives it not. He said: So we thought he meant this verse 'O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies.'" End of Ibn Kathīr's words.

The point here is that our Master Umar *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* when he asked the glorious Companion Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* to send him the news and write to him what was happening in Iraq at that time, he [Abū Mūsā] took a Christian scribe who was good at writing and so on. So our Master Umar, in correspondence between them, rebuked this and scolded him. In a narration, he reminded him, so when he [Abū Mūsā] persisted saying there is no one else, meaning there is no one other than this lad in good writing and good calculation, he said to him in a word: "The lad has died. Ended." Meaning: You say Muslims need this Christian lad for writing and viewing secrets, and these are the state bureaus (*Dawāwīn*) and state secrets, so our Master Umar means that. How can you expose him to the state bureaus? He said: "The lad has died." Meaning: If Allāh took this lad, how would you manage your affairs? So he means: Learn, and bring near to you a Muslim, even if he is lesser in writing. He means: Do

not bring them near when Allāh has distanced them, as in a narration, "By Allāh, I will not bring them near when Allāh has distanced them."

Imām Al-Qurṭubī said: "'Then indeed, he is [one] of them': The Exalted clarified that his ruling is like their ruling. This prevents establishing inheritance for the Muslim from the apostate", meaning a Muslim who apostatized, the Muslim does not inherit from the disbeliever, nor the disbeliever from the Muslim.

"The one who allied with them was Ibn Ubayy. Then this ruling remains until the Day of Resurrection in severing alliance, for it is general and remaining until the Day of Resurrection." This was a specific cause, as this verse was revealed regarding this hypocrite, but this is a general verse; the specificity of the cause does not prevent that, for it is general and remaining until the Day of Resurrection—meaning the ruling of severing alliance.

"And the Exalted said: 'And do not incline toward those who do wrong, lest you be touched by the Fire.' [QS. Hūd: 113] And the Exalted also said in Āl 'Imrān: 'Let not believers take disbelievers as allies rather than believers.' [QS. Āl 'Imrān: 28] And the Exalted said: 'Do not take a *biṭānah* from other than yourselves.'" Al-Qurṭubī cites such verses that indicate severing alliance.

"And it was said the meaning of 'some of them are allies of others': in support; some of them are allies supporting one another. 'And whoever is an ally to them among you, then indeed, he is [one] of them,' Al-Qurṭubī said: Condition and answer. Because he has opposed Allāh the Exalted and His Messenger just as they opposed, so enmity towards him became obligatory just as enmity towards them became obligatory, and the Fire became obligatory for him just as it became obligatory for them. So he became of them, meaning of their companions," meaning the one who allies with disbelievers, even if he is a Muslim, as Al-Qurṭubī said.

The scholar Imām Al-Shawkānī in *Fatḥ al-Qadīr*, he explains the reason for these sentences in the verse when the Exalted said: "O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people", he says: "The intent of the prohibition against taking them as allies is that they be treated with the treatment of allies in friendship, cohabitation, and support. And His saying: 'They are [in fact] allies of one another' is a justification (*Ta'līl*) for the prohibition. The meaning is that some Jews are allies to other Jews, and some Christians are allies to other Christians. 'Some' does not mean one of the two sects of Jews

and Christians and 'the other' mean the other sect, due to the certainty that they are in the utmost enmity and discord, because Allāh the Exalted says about them: 'The Jews say "The Christians have nothing [true] to stand on," and the Christians say, "The Jews have nothing to stand on".' [QS. Al-Baqarah: 113]. It was said the intent is that each of the two sects allies with the other, assists it, and supports it in enmity against the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and enmity against what he brought, even if they are enemies and opponents among themselves."

Exactly as we see now the alliances: Jews and Christians against Muslims, and with them now you find China, India, Japan, and all denominations and sects; atheists and communists, everyone entering with one another. All these are in a complete alliance against Islam and the people of Islam, despite the enmity between them. The idolater united with the atheist, united with the Christian, united with the Jew, to eradicate the identity of Islam. As for among themselves, yes, there are disputes and wars, and World War I and II and others, and historical wars; millions of humans were killed as a result of these religious enmities between them, which appeared to be for issues of influence and economy, but in reality, they were fundamentally religious wars.

"And the aspect of justifying the prohibition with this sentence, i.e., 'They are allies of one another', implies that this alliance is the habit of these disbelievers, not your habit, O believers. So do not do what is of their action lest you become like them. Therefore, He followed this justifying sentence with what is like a result for it, when He said: 'And whoever is an ally to them among you, then indeed, he is [one] of them.' This is the result, meaning he is among their group and in their count, and it is a severe threat. For the sin necessitating Kufr is that which has reached a limit beyond which there is no limit. And His saying: 'Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people' is a justification for the sentence before it; meaning their falling into Kufr is due to the lack of guidance from Him, *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā,* for the one who wronged himself by what necessitates Kufr, like the one who allies with the disbelievers." This is the speech of Imām Al-Shawkānī.

The scholar Sheikh Al-Sa‘dī comments on this verse and explains it saying: "Allāh the Exalted guides His believing slaves, when He clarified to them the conditions of the Jews and Christians and their un-good attributes, not to take them as allies. For they are allies of one another, supporting one another, and being a hand against those other than them. So you, do not take them as allies, for they are the enemies in reality, and they do not care about harming you; rather, they spare nothing of their effort to mislead you. So no one allies with them except one who is like them.

Therefore, the Exalted said: 'And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them,' because Complete *Tawallī* necessitates transferring to their religion, and Little *Tawallī* calls to Much, then he graduates little by little until the slave becomes of them. 'Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people,' meaning those whom Allāh described with wrongdoing (*Ẓulm*); the state of those whom this wrongdoing describes, and to it they return, meaning to it they go back. 'And if you brought to those who were given the Scripture every sign, they would not follow your Qiblah. Nor will you be a follower of their Qiblah. Nor would they be followers of one another's Qiblah.' [QS. Al-Baqarah: 145]" Meaning: Why do we tire ourselves and bring them near!

The word "Wrongdoing" (*Ẓulm*) you find in the Quran means to place a thing in other than its place. It contradicts the word Wisdom (*Ḥikmah*) and Justice (*'Adl*). Wisdom is to place a thing in its place. When you bring near an enemy to Allāh and His Messenger and to you, Allāh said he is your enemy as well, so you bring him near to you; then you are a wrongdoer (*Ẓālim*) because you placed the thing in other than its place. Likewise, if you brought near the believers and allied with them, and disassociated and distanced yourself from the disbelievers, polytheists, atheists, and all these categories, then you have placed the thing in its place. In this case, you are not a wrongdoer. "Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people"; He does not grant them success for guidance after He clarified to them. "And your Lord is not ever unjust to [His] servants."

Of course, the rest of these evidences we will review in the next lecture, *In shā' Allāh*, but I conclude with this verse, the saying of Allāh the Exalted in Sūrah Al-Nisā':

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِن دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ۚ أَتُرِيدُونَ أَن تَجْعَلُوا لِلَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ سُلْطَانًا مُّبِينًا

"O you who have believed, do not take the disbelievers as allies instead of the believers. Do you wish to give Allah against you a clear authority?" [QS. Al-Nisā': 144]

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr says: "Allāh the Exalted forbids His believing slaves from taking the disbelievers as allies instead of the believers, meaning accompanying them, befriending them, advising them, confiding affection to them, and divulging the inner conditions of the believers to them. As the Exalted said: 'Let not believers take disbelievers as allies rather than believers. And whoever [of you] does that has nothing with Allah, except when taking precaution against them in prudence. And Allah

warns you of Himself.' [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 28] Meaning He warns you of His punishment in your committing of His prohibition. Therefore, He said here: 'Do you wish to give Allah against you a clear authority (*Sulṭān Mubīn*)?'" Clear *Sulṭān* means an argument (*Ḥujjah*); to give Allāh an argument against you in His punishment of you. O believers, how can you do that? Meaning do you want Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* to have a refuting argument, an authority over you to punish you with?! Ibn Abī Ḥātim said and cited with his chain of narration from Ibn ‘Abbās regarding His saying "Clear authority": He said: "Every *Sulṭān* in the Quran is *Ḥujjah* (argument/proof)." Meaning argument. Mujāhid and others and some scholars said likewise.

So the *Sulṭān* here is the Argument. Notice the verse is clear in prohibition: "O you who have believed, do not take the disbelievers as allies instead of the believers." This is a prohibition, and there is no context (*qarīnah*) to divert this prohibition from [meaning] unlawfulness (*Taḥrīm*). "Do you wish to give Allah against you a clear authority?!" Allāh frightens them and clarifies to them: Beware of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* and beware His punishment and beware the argument against you if you take these people, support them, bring them near, make them friends who view your secrets, accompany them, and back them against the believers. "Do you wish to give Allah against you a clear authority" means do you want Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* to punish you with this argument against you?!

We conclude with this verse, and *In shā’ Allāh*, in the next third lecture, *In shā’ Allāh*, we will complete the Shar‘ī evidences.

I say this statement of mine and ask Allāh for forgiveness for me and for you. May Allāh bless you, and may Allāh reward you with all good.

Al-salāmu ‘alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Third Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allāh from the evils of our souls and the bad consequences of our deeds. Whomever Allāh guides, there is none to misguide him, and whomever He leaves astray, there is none to guide him. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Noble brothers everywhere, *Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh*.

This is the third lecture among the lectures on *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* (Loyalty and Disavowal) or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* (Alliance and Enmity). We spoke in the two previous lectures, in the first lecture, I spoke with you about the methodology we are outlining and following in these lectures. We spoke about the importance of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* as a creedal concept, and we also spoke about the status of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* in the Creed (*'Aqīdah*). We also discussed a sample of important Shar'ī books and references written on this subject.

In the second lecture, we spoke about *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* as a linguistic and terminological definition. We discussed the definition of *Al-Walā'* in the Arabic language, in Islamic Shari'ah, and according to the jurists (*Fuqahā'*). Then we proceeded to the evidences, and we cited some evidences from the Holy Quran. Today, we will complete these evidences, because I told you before that there are more than twenty verses, and some count them as more than thirty verses speaking about the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* in the Holy Quran.

We said that this doctrine or this concept, the principle of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* or *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, is among the clearest evidences and clearest subjects in Islamic Shari'ah, especially in the Holy Quran and the Prophetic Sunnah. Despite this clarity, we were surprised in this contemporary reality in which we live that this issue, despite its clarity, is among the most diluted issues and the most diluted doctrines among many contemporary scholars.

We will complete what we said, but I would like to clarify, to stimulate the memory and refresh the memory of our brothers, alerting them to what we said regarding the linguistic meaning of the word *Mawlā* or the word *Walī*. We said that the word *Walī* is a noun applied to a large group; it is a collective noun for many names. It means the Lord (*Al-Rabb*), the Master (*Al-Sayyid*), the Owner (*Al-Mālik*), the Benefactor (*Al-Mun'im*),

the Manumitter (*Al-Mu‘tiq*), the Helper (*Al-Nāṣir*), the Lover (*Al-Muḥibb*), the Follower (*Al-Tābi‘*), and the Neighbor (*Al-Jār*). This was stated by Ibn al-Athīr in *Al-Nihāyah*. It also means the cousin, the ally (*Ḥalīf*), the confederate (*‘Aqīd*), the in-law (*Ṣihr*), the slave (*‘Abd*), the emancipated slave, and the beneficiary. All of these have appeared and have context clues (*Qarā’in*) in the Prophetic Ḥadīth, and they also have context clues among the Arabs in their poetry, language, and speech.

Therefore, there is a connection between the linguistic definition and the Shar‘ī definition. Thus, *Al-Muwālāh* is applied, as we said through this linguistic compilation of this multiple meaning, to support, agreement, following, obedience, affection, love, and proximity. All these characteristics are called *Muwālāh*. This is from the general linguistic aspect. However, from the Shar‘ī aspect, what is the meaning of the religiously obligatory *Muwālāh*?

It is that the Muslim, the believing human, who verifies this religion and verifies this Messenger who conveys from his Lord, directs these qualities (all these meanings of the word *Walī*) to Allāh, to His Messenger, and to the believers. Meaning, his love is for Allāh, his support is for Allāh, his proximity is for Allāh, and his affection is for Allāh, and for His Messenger naturally. As Allāh the Exalted said:

وَمَن يَتَوَلَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فَإِنَّ حِزْبَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْغَالِبُونَ

"And whoever is an ally to Allah and His Messenger and those who have believed - indeed, the party of Allah - they will be the predominant." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 56]

This is the obligatory *Muwālāh* according to Shari'ah.

As for the *Muwālāh* prohibited by Shari'ah, it is that the Muslim directs these characteristics, meanings of *Al-Walā’*, to the disbelievers. As the Exalted said:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا عَدُوِّي وَعَدُوَّكُمْ أَوْلِيَاءَ

"O you who have believed, do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies." [QS. Al-Mumtaḥanah: 1]

As we mentioned before in the verse of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah (or Al-Mumtaḥinah), Allāh the Exalted has obligated the believers to show enmity to the disbelievers, hate them, and fight them as much as they are able. As the Exalted said:

قَدْ كَانَتْ لَكُمْ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ فِي إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ إِذْ قَالُوا لِقَوْمِهِمْ إِنَّا بُرَآءُ مِنكُمْ وَمِمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ كَفَرْنَا بِكُمْ وَبَدَا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمُ الْعَدَاوَةُ وَالْبَغْضَاءُ أَبَدًا حَتَّىٰ تُؤْمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَحْدَهُ

"There has already been for you an excellent pattern in Abraham and those with him, when they said to their people, 'Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from whatever you worship other than Allah. We have denied you, and there has appeared between us and you animosity and hatred forever until you believe in Allah alone.'" [QS. Al-Mumtaḥanah: 4]

So, the prohibited *Muwālāh* according to Shari'ah is for the Muslim to direct these meanings of *Muwālāh*, so he loves the disbelievers, shows them affection, draws near to them, becomes an intimate associate (*Biṭānah*) for them, and is close to them. All these meanings we spoke about regarding obligatory *Muwālāh*, he directs them to these disbelievers and hypocrites instead of directing them to Allāh. Therefore, the Exalted said:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ جَاهِدِ الْكُفَّارَ وَالْمُنَافِقِينَ وَاغْلُظْ عَلَيْهِمْ ۚ وَمَأْوَاهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ ۖ وَبِئْسَ الْمَصِيرُ

"O Prophet, fight against the disbelievers and the hypocrites and be harsh upon them. And their refuge is Hell, and wretched is the destination." [QS. Al-Tawbah: 73]

This is the entrance with which we will begin the verses, *In shā' Allāh*. Therefore, we say: Whoever acts contrary to this *Muwālāh* in the linguistic and Shar'ī sense, directing this love, this proximity, this affection, this friendliness, this support, this alliance, and this following (because all these are meanings of *Al-Walī*), whoever acts contrary to this and follows the disbelievers, or loves them, or obeys them, or supports them, has indeed allied with them (*tawallāhum*). And whoever allies with them has disbelieved, due to the saying of the Exalted: "And whoever is an ally to them among you, then indeed, he is [one] of them." His disbelief is confirmed if he obeys the disbelievers or supports them in what harms Islam and the Muslims.

We will speak about this naturally, as I told you, *In shā' Allāh*, when we speak about the effective cause that necessitates takfīr (*Al-Manāṭ al-Mukaffir*) in the subject of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-*

Mu‘ādāh. We will speak about that in detail and about the disagreement of people regarding this, because there are several *Manāṭs* (causes/bases) and not a single *Manāṭ* as some think. We will speak about the doubts of contemporaries on this subject, especially as I told you I will review the subject regarding the story of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah, and especially when we speak about the ruling on the spy in Islam, espionage, and these thorny issues which we will discuss later.

However, sometimes while we are listing the evidences, we are compelled to address things step by step and touch upon them lightly so we can enter the core of the subject, because ideas build upon one another. Therefore, this will be good when we reach the main thorny point, which is "Aiding the Disbelievers" (*Muẓāharat al-Kuffār*), the ruling, and the major disagreement.

This is the cause of dilution and loss of this issue; because it relates to rulings of Kufr (Disbelief) and Īmān (Faith). I told you the issue of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* is not a recreational or cultural issue, nor merely matters for gathering information and that's it! No, these are issues upon which depends Kufr and Īmān, Paradise and Hellfire. Upon it depends *Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*; upon it depends certain levels in *Al-Muwālāh* and certain levels in *Al-Mu‘ādāh*.

We begin now with a verse among these verses, because we will review a sample of verses from the Quran. I completed some verses with you, approximately four verses in the previous lecture. Now we try to pass over some verses that serve as evidence for the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* in Islamic Shari'ah and in the Holy Quran. Up to now, the evidences are only from the Holy Quran. Naturally, we will review some things from the Sunnah, stances from the Sīrah (Biography of the Prophet), and issues neglected by some who address this issue despite its clarity, even from the Sīrah of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*.

I told you that I do not take a specific verse in the sense that you understand this is verse number one and the other is the second. I take a sample like this; I start with what I wish. Meaning the matter is not ordered [numerically]; we start with any verse that comes to us.

Now we start with this verse in [Sūrah Al-Mujādilah]. Allāh the Exalted says: I seek refuge in Allāh from the accursed Satan.

لَّا تَجِدُ قَوْمًا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ يُوَادُّونَ مَنْ حَادَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَلَوْ كَانُوا آبَاءَهُمْ أَوْ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ أَوْ إِخْوَانَهُمْ أَوْ عَشِيرَتَهُمْ ۚ أُولَٰئِكَ

كَتَبَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمُ الْإِيمَانَ وَأَيَّدَهُم بِرُوحٍ مِّنْهُ ۖ وَيُدْخِلُهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِن تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا ۚ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ ۚ أُولَٰئِكَ حِزْبُ اللَّهِ ۚ أَلَا إِنَّ حِزْبَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

"You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger, even if they were their fathers or their sons or their brothers or their kindred. Those - He has decreed within their hearts faith and supported them with spirit from Him. And We will admit them to gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they abide eternally. Allah is pleased with them, and they are pleased with Him - those are the party of Allah. Unquestionably, the party of Allah - they are the successful." [QS. Al-Mujādilah: 22]

This is a magnificent verse among the verses of the Holy Quran regarding the Shar'ī evidences on the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* in the Quran.

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr says: "The Exalted said: 'You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger, even if they were their fathers or their sons or their brothers or their kindred'; meaning they do not show affection to the enemies and opposers even if they are from the closest relatives. As the Exalted said in another verse: 'Let not believers take disbelievers as allies rather than believers. And whoever [of you] does that has nothing with Allah, except when taking precaution against them in prudence. And Allah warns you of Himself.' [QS. Āl 'Imrān: 28]"

Naturally, the issue of the difference between *Taqiyyah* (precaution), *Ikrāh* (coercion), *Muwālāh*, *Mudāhanah* (flattery/compromise), and *Mudārah* (diplomacy); all of this we will speak about later, but this is only pointing to the verse.

And the Exalted also said:

قُلْ إِن كَانَ آبَاؤُكُمْ وَأَبْنَاؤُكُمْ وَإِخْوَانُكُمْ وَأَزْوَاجُكُمْ وَعَشِيرَتُكُمْ وَأَمْوَالٌ اقْتَرَفْتُمُوهَا وَتِجَارَةٌ تَخْشَوْنَ كَسَادَهَا وَمَسَاكِنُ تَرْضَوْنَهَا

"Say, [O Muhammad], 'If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your wives, your relatives, wealth which you have obtained, commerce wherein you fear decline, and dwellings with which you are pleased...'" [QS. Al-Tawbah: 24]

All this is on one side. These are the origins of the distractions that distract a human from his religion, from his love for Allāh and His Messenger, and from Jihad in the path of Allāh. Notice all this is in one scale. In contrast is Allāh and His Messenger. This religion needs iron to protect it:

وَأَنزَلْنَا الْحَدِيدَ فِيهِ بَأْسٌ شَدِيدٌ وَمَنَافِعُ لِلنَّاسِ

"And We sent down iron, wherein is great military might and benefits for the people." [QS. Al-Ḥadīd: 25]

Therefore, Allāh the Exalted says in contrast in this verse afterwards:

أَحَبَّ إِلَيْكُم مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ وَجِهَادٍ فِي سَبِيلِهِ فَتَرَبَّصُوا حَتَّىٰ يَأْتِيَ اللَّهُ بِأَمْرِهِ ۗ وَاللَّهُ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الْفَاسِقِينَ

"...are more beloved to you than Allah and His Messenger and jihad in His cause, then wait until Allah executes His command. And Allah does not guide the defiantly disobedient people." [QS. Al-Tawbah: 24]

Meaning all of this in one scale and all of that in one scale. And this is what happened.

Therefore, some exegetes said: It was revealed concerning Abū ‘Ubaydah b. al-Jarrāḥ *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* when he killed his father on the day of Badr; and ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb when he killed his maternal uncle; and Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq when he intended to kill his son in the battle and his son turned away from him. And as in the story of the captives of Badr, when the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* consulted the Muslims regarding the captives of Badr. Al-Ṣiddīq advised that they be ransomed with money, but ‘Umar rejected that and said: "O Messenger of Allāh, enable So-and-so over So-and-so —and these were relatives and cousins—" Then he said: "I see nothing but that you enable me over So-and-so —a relative of ‘Umar— so I kill him, and enable ‘Alī over ‘Aqīl, and enable So-and-so over So-and-so, so that Allāh knows that there is no affection in our hearts for the polytheists." Notice, this is *Al-Walā’*; this is the evidence.

So this is true love, and this is true, pure, unadulterated *Muwālāh*. We will review for you, when we speak in an introduction from the Prophetic Sīrah as evidence in the issue of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*

and *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, after we finish these Shar'ī evidences, *In shā' Allāh*.

Therefore, Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* clarified in this that these allies are the Party of Allāh (*Ḥizb Allāh*). So they are the Party of Allāh, and in contrast is the Party of Satan. The Party of Allāh means His allies, His helpers, His loyal ones; they are those following Him, obeying Him, submitting to Him, and humble before Him. This is the meaning.

The scholar Al-Sa'dī says when commenting on this verse: "'You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger'; meaning this and that cannot coexist, meaning this believer and this one opposing Allāh and His Messenger. So a slave is not truly a believer in Allāh and the Last Day unless he acts according to the requirement of Faith and its implications, such as loving those who establish Faith and allying with them, and hating those who do not establish it and showing enmity to them, even if they were the closest people to him." This is Faith in reality; this is its fruit, and this is its planting that does not shake. This is the Faith which is Love for the sake of Allāh and Hatred for the sake of Allāh. And this *Walā'* (following, obedience, proximity, support) is what the Quran speaks about in this verse.

Al-Sa'dī says: "As for the one who claims that he believes in Allāh and the [Last] Day while he is affectionate to the enemies of Allāh, loving those who cast Faith behind their backs, then this is an alleged faith — meaning a claim and pretension— that has no reality. For every matter must have a proof that verifies it; mere claim avails nothing and its owner is not believed."

As for Imām Al-Qurṭubī in his Tafsīr, he says commenting on this verse, notice the beautiful conciseness he utters: "He clarified that Faith is corrupted by allying with disbelievers", merely allying with disbelievers corrupts your faith, "even if they are relatives. Mālik *raḥimahullāh* inferred from this verse the enmity towards the Qadariyyah and abandoning sitting with them. Ashhab said on the authority of Mālik: 'Do not sit with the Qadariyyah and show enmity to them for the sake of Allāh, due to the saying of the Exalted: You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger.'" Who was this revealed about? Imām Mālik speaks about the Qadariyyah, meaning the deniers of Divine Decree (*Qadar*), those innovators. Imagine Mālik says that he applies this verse and says do not sit [with them], meaning you are commanded to show enmity to them.

It is not as some do, saying: "My heart is pure, I find no hatred for anyone. I encompass all people, even those who insult me, even those who

offend Islam; my heart is a pasture for all of them!" Meaning a pasture for gazelles and a pasture for swine, it means this. How can the swine and the gazelle gather in the chest of a believer?!

Then he says: "I find nothing in my heart due to my love for Allāh," as they rely on Rābi‘ah al-‘Adawiyyah and things some Sufis say. "Do you hate Satan, O Rābi‘ah? She said: How can I hate him? My love for my Lord has made my heart busy with love and not hatred." *A‘ūdhu billāh*! "They supplicate to Us in hope and fear" [reference to QS. Al-Anbyā’: 90]; fear and hope, this is the sound Creed. "Then take him as an enemy," "Indeed, Satan is an enemy to you." Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* commanded us to show enmity to Satan fundamentally. So this is absurdity.

Imagine Imām Mālik says: Do not sit with the Qadariyyah and show enmity to them. Why? He relies on the saying of the Exalted: "You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger." Well, the Qadariyyah or Secularism? The Qadariyyah or the Democrats? Or the Parliamentarians (*Majlisiyyīn*)? Or the Ballot-Box Partisans (*Ṣandūqiyyīn*)? Or the miserable scattered ones (*Al-Abābīd Al-Manākīd*) who worship an idol named "Elections" for which Allāh has sent down no authority? And these councils that legislate with other than what Allāh has revealed? Or these partisans who compromise on the constants of the religion?!

The Qadariyyah were ascetics (*Zuhhād*), and in general, they loved the Shari'ah. Manifest misguidance entered them from this philosophical mind and philosophical traces that entered them and destroyed them. So this is the innovation (*Bid‘ah*). But they were worshippers and ascetics and so on. Despite that, he said: Do not sit with them! So what about us? If Imām Mālik were in our era now, what would he do? Perhaps he would have melted from worry and distress, melted or evaporated, as a result of the rage and grief that would have happened to him. He would have exploded; he would have become scattered pieces if he lived and saw these "pseudo-religious secularists" (*‘Ilmāsiyyīn Muta’aslimīn*) and those who fabricate justifications (*Mutamadriqīn*). By Allāh, if any of these scholars were alive... It is from the mercy of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* that He did not test them. We are wretched; we are destined to be tested by these secularists, democrats, and those who sold the religion. Someone insults the Lord and says "I am a Muslim in my heart." Another is an atheist and insults the Lord and says "I am an atheist and I am a communist, do you declare me a disbeliever (*Takfīr*)?" He says to him: "I do not declare you a disbeliever." *A‘ūdhu billāh*! Someone says to you: "I am a communist, I am an atheist, I follow another religion," and you say to him: "I do not

declare you a disbeliever"?!! We ask Allāh for safety, *A‘ūdhu billāh*! *A‘ūdhu billāh*!

This verse which Imām Ibn Kathīr spoke about, and we said that Sheikh Imām Sulaymān b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (the grandson) in his book *Al-Dalā’il fī Ḥukm Muwālāt Ahl al-Ishrāk*, which we spoke about, and he is the martyr *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* the young Mujahid, jurist, and scholar, author of these blessed treatises. When he commented on this verse, he says with utmost severity, therefore some try to prohibit, criminalize, or prevent the publishing or printing of such treatises, Sheikh Sulaymān says, *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi*: "The Exalted informed that you will not find one who believes in Allāh and the Last Day showing affection to one who opposes Allāh and His Messenger, even if he were the closest relative. And [He informed] that this contradicts Faith and is opposed to it; it and Faith do not coexist except as water and fire coexist. The Exalted said in another place: 'O you who have believed, do not take your fathers or your brothers as allies if they have preferred disbelief over belief. And whoever does so among you - then it is those who are the wrongdoers.' [QS. Al-Tawbah: 23] In these two verses is a clear statement that there is no excuse for anyone in agreeing with Kufr, out of fear for wealth, fathers, sons, wives, clans, and similar things by which many people excuse themselves. If no one was granted a concession (*Rukhṣah*) to show them affection and take them as allies for their own sakes out of fear of them and preferring their pleasure, then how about one who takes distant disbelievers as allies and companions?! And shows them agreement with their religion out of fear for some of these matters and love for them?! And amazingly, they deem that good and declare it lawful, so they combined with Apostasy the declaration of the forbidden as lawful." This is the speech of the scholar Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* in his commentary on the verse of Sūrah Al-Mujādilah "You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah..."

We also have another verse which we will address now, which is the saying of the Exalted in [Sūrah Al-Nisā’: 138-139]:

بَشِّرِ الْمُنَافِقِينَ بِأَنَّ لَهُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيمًا الَّذِينَ يَتَّخِذُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِن دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ۚ أَيَبْتَغُونَ عِندَهُمُ الْعِزَّةَ فَإِنَّ الْعِزَّةَ لِلَّهِ جَمِيعًا

"Give tidings to the hypocrites that there is for them a painful punishment - Those who take disbelievers as allies instead of the believers. Do they seek with them honor [through power]? But indeed, honor belongs to Allah entirely." [QS. Al-Nisā’: 138-139]

This verse is of utmost gravity. Your skin shivers when you see this concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* eroding and being diluted while hearing such verses.

Imām Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭabarī said in his Tafsīr: "'Those who take disbelievers as allies instead of the believers'; so from the description of the hypocrites, Allāh the Exalted says to His Prophet: O Muḥammad — *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*— give tidings to the hypocrites who take the people of disbelief in Me and deviation in My religion as allies, meaning helpers and friends instead of the believers (meaning other than the believers). 'Do they seek with them honor?!' He says: Do they seek with them protection and strength by taking them as allies instead of the people of belief in Me?! 'But indeed, honor belongs to Allah entirely'; for those who took allies from the disbelievers seeking honor with them are the humiliated, the few. Why did they not take allies from the believers and seek honor, protection, and support from Allāh, to Whom belongs honor and protection, Who honors whom He wills and humiliates whom He wills, so He honors them and protects them?" This is the speech of Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī in his Tafsīr.

The word "Al-‘Izzah" (Honor/Glory) means in the Arabic language severity/strength. It is said "*Arḍ ‘azāz*" meaning hard, severe ground. Therefore he says: "*‘Azza ‘alayya firāquka*" meaning your separation has become severe/hard for me, or your pain has become severe for me; we say it in our speech, and it means intensified and strengthened.

Al-Rāzī says in his commentary on the verse: "The hypocrites used to seek honor and strength due to their connection with the Jews, so Allāh the Exalted invalidated this opinion of theirs by their saying 'But indeed, honor belongs to Allah entirely.'"

Imām Abū Al-Sa‘ūd says in his Tafsīr: "'Do they seek with them honor?'; A denial of their opinion, an invalidation of it, a statement of the failure of their hope, and a cutting off of their empty ambitions. Meaning they seek strength and dominance through allying with the disbelievers, while all individuals of Honor are confined to His side, *‘Azza wa Jalla wa ‘Alā*, such that it is attained only by His allies for whom He decreed honor and dominance. The Exalted said: 'And to Allah belongs [all] honor, and to His Messenger, and to the believers.' [QS. Al-Munāfiqūn: 8] And it is impossible to benefit from someone who benefits from other than Allāh, His Messenger, and the believers."

Imagine those who take pride in, or fear, or ally with these people, and seek support and honor from America and the constitution warring against Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* and those who seek honor from the

European Union, and seek honor from every Tom, Dick, and Harry against this great Islam. So "Do they seek with them honor? But indeed, honor belongs to Allah entirely."

So if honor belongs to Allāh entirely, why do you patch up your religion?! Why do you patch up this Great Quran?! Why this rubbing up against the incomplete application of Shari'ah?! Why this patching up of this paper constitution and this idol worshipped besides Allāh?! Why? "Do they seek with them honor? But indeed, honor belongs to Allah entirely."

Ibn ʻAṭiyyah said in *Al-Muḥarrar al-Wajīz fī Tafsīr al-Kitāb al-ʻAzīz*: "Then the Exalted stated in the description of the hypocrites the most harmful aspect to the believers, which is their allying with the disbelievers and casting aside the believers. He alerted to the corruption of that so that whoever among the believers might fall into a type of it out of heedlessness, ignorance, or leniency would leave it. Then the Exalted paused by way of rebuke on their intent in that: Is it seeking honor and increasing numbers through them? Meaning the matter is not so; rather, all honor belongs to Allāh; He gives it to whom He wills. He has promised it to the believers and made the [good] outcome for the righteous." This is the speech of Ibn ʻAṭiyyah.

Ibn Kathīr also says: "So the Exalted said, denying upon them what they pursued of allying with disbelievers: 'Do they seek with them honor?' Then the Exalted informed that all honor belongs to Allāh alone, having no partner, and to whomever He made it for. As the Exalted said in the other verse: 'Whoever desires honor [through power] - then to Allah belongs all honor.' [QS. Fāṭir: 10] And the Exalted said: 'And to Allah belongs [all] honor, and to His Messenger, and to the believers, but the hypocrites do not know.' The purpose of this agitation, meaning stirring feelings in you, is to seek honor from the side of Allāh, to turn to His servitude, and to join the group of His believing slaves, who have support in this worldly life and on the Day the witnesses stand." This is the speech of Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr *raḥmatullāhi ʻalayhi*.

Al-Saʻdī concludes it as well and says: The word "Give tidings to the hypocrites" (*Bashshir*). Glad tidings (*Bishārah*) are used, as you know, originally for good meaning and happy news. But this is by way of sarcasm towards them. He says: "'Give tidings to the hypocrites'; meaning wretched is what you took as helpers and allies for yourselves. 'And give tidings to the hypocrites', meaning those who showed Islam and concealed Kufr, 'of the ugliest and worst tiding, which is the painful punishment.'" He gave them tidings of painful punishment. When I say: "And give tidings," you

expect a tiding or a happy word. I say to you: "We give you tidings of a painful punishment," I say to you: "Glad tidings of failure, glad tidings of loss!" It means that I terrify you. I give you a word so you rejoice, then you fall into the same state and collapse. "Taste" (*Dhuq*), so you think you will taste something noble, then He says: "Taste! Indeed, you are the honored, the noble!" [QS. Al-Dukhān: 49]. This is for the disbeliever when he enters Hellfire. It is said to him "Taste" of the scalding water and purulence. But "Taste here, indeed you are the honored, the noble", honored among us, but in Hellfire. So it is by way of rebuke and reprimand. This is for the hypocrites who took these people as helpers and allied with them.

"Do they seek with them honor?" This is the reality of the conditions of hypocrites. Their opinion of Allāh became bad, and their certainty in Allāh's support for His believing slaves became weak. Those who take America, for example, as allies and helpers, or take pride in them, or ally with them; or take the West and East; or take non-believers; or take Christians, Jews, and disbelievers as allies. Why? Their opinion of Allāh became bad, and their certainty in Allāh's support for His believing slaves became weak. He says "Perhaps they will ally and work," always wavering. Notice some reasons that are with the disbelievers: they have power and technology, they have Apache helicopters, B-52s, and they have all progress, satellites, etc. These causes, causes of apparent strength with them. And their vision fell short of what is behind that. Their vision fell short [of seeing] that there is a Lord for this universe. And these people overcome; if it were in their ability, they would have destroyed crops and livestock and exterminated Muslims to the last one, but they could not. If America, the Jews, and all these people had this power, they would have exterminated the Palestinians. What do these Palestinians possess? In Gaza alone, they would have exterminated them to the last one if they possessed [absolute power], if they were able. But Allāh casts terror into their hearts.

If they possessed [absolute power], they would have exterminated the entirety (*Khaḍrā'*) of Muslims in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere if they possessed it. Were it not for the descendants of Abū Righāl and this evil *biṭānah* and criminal *biṭānah*, and these hypocrites who live inside the *Ummah*, striking the *Ummah* in its flanks and sides, and dealing with the enemies, and they are their eyes which must be gouged out, were it not for these, these wretched ones would not have been able to mount the backs of our *Ummah*.

Therefore, Ibn Kathīr says: "And their vision fell short of what is behind that, so they took the disbelievers as allies, seeking honor through them and seeking support, while the situation is that honor belongs to Allāh entirely." This speech is said to all those people, the group of "box-

worshippers" (*Mutaṣandiqīn*), the worshippers of domes, the dome of Parliament, and those who believe that Islamic Shari'ah will come through the dome, and believe it comes through the boxes! Their endeavor failed, their opinion failed, and they failed in everything, even in the last experiment, but they did not take heed. Allāh the Exalted says:

أَوَلَا يَرَوْنَ أَنَّهُمْ يُفْتَنُونَ فِي كُلِّ عَامٍ مَّرَّةً أَوْ مَرَّتَيْنِ ثُمَّ لَا يَتُوبُونَ وَلَا هُمْ يَذَّكَّرُونَ

> "Do they not see that they are tried every year once or twice but then they do not repent nor do they remember?" [QS. Al-Tawbah: 126]

Glory be to Allāh, they play with them, yet despite that, they insist on establishing parties!

Today in Egypt there was the founding of a party, a party called "The People" (*Al-Sha'b*), in the name of the "Salafist Front." The funny thing is that all those sitting on the platform, you find them, *mā shā' Allāh*, all having long, thick beards, *mā shā' Allāh*, but all of them are wearing ties! Meaning if you are not wearing a tie and wearing this necktie, will they consider you a disbeliever in democracy, for example?! You became an Islamist and still have remnants and traces of Islam?! And they wear the best suits, meaning things one hears about and reads about in books!

And those who are founding a party for the people brought a Christian man, saying: "This is from the moderate Copts." And he says to them: "You are from the moderate Islamists." Notice the creedal dilution! The man was frank, better than the Salafists who call themselves this Salafist Front. What did he say to them?

This is at the core of the lesson, lest anyone think we strayed from the subject. He says to them, and I heard it on Al-Jazeera Mubasher saying thus: "We want the beautiful, moderate Islam, and you present to us the picture of the sweet, beautiful Islam", meaning which the Christians are pleased with, "which brings us together", meaning the concept of Citizenship (*Muwāṭanah*), "so we and you are equal in the concept of Citizenship." And no one replied to him. Glory be to Allāh!

The concept of Citizenship fundamentally contradicts the concept of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. The concept of Citizenship is against Islam fundamentally! Against Shari'ah; in Shari'ah, Islam is superior and nothing is superior to it. "You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger."

These people oppose Allāh and His Messenger. These people fight Islam. These people do not want Islamic Shari'ah. These people who incite the West against you. These people who imprison your sisters and brothers who return to Islam and leave their religion; they imprison them as in the story of Wafā’ Qusṭanṭīn and others.

And no one commented! The concept of Citizenship simply means loyalty to citizenship, to the land, to the country in which you grew up regardless of religion; a Christian can hold governance by the concept of Citizenship! This is Citizenship; religion has no relation. An atheist, a Baha'i, a communist, anything; a woman can rule. This is the concept of Citizenship. It is against what they founded, even in the speech they want to do!

When they said "The People's Party," okay, no contention, but this man who praises you was better and more frank than you, and truthful with himself, and in harmony with himself. This is a great tribulation, and these are the verses of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā*: "Do they seek with them honor?!"

You brought someone to patch up for you, and improve for you, even to say: "National Unity, and we are Salafists, and we are not against Christians..." so we brought a Christian to speak, and they might have some Christians now as members in the party. Why, exactly? "Do they seek with them honor? But indeed, honor belongs to Allah entirely." Talk to us, if you believe that honor belongs to Allāh entirely, then why do you seek honor in other than Him?! Is your religion incomplete? Meaning Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* did not convey? The Quran did not convey? Make us understand, O people!!

Ibn Kathīr says: "Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* guaranteed the victory of His religion and His believing slaves, even if some testing permeates that for His believing slaves." A test.

أَحَسِبَ النَّاسُ أَن يُتْرَكُوا أَن يَقُولُوا آمَنَّا وَهُمْ لَا يُفْتَنُونَ

> "Do the people think that they will be left to say, 'We believe' and they will not be tried?" [QS. Al-‘Ankabūt: 2]

Naturally, we will be tested. Our lands are occupied, we are chased, they imprison us, gallows, military courts, state security courts; this is a test. "The people most severely tested are the Prophets, then the righteous, then the next best, then the next best. A man is tested according to his religion." According to his religion, it is increased for him, because there is firmness in it. This is the *Fitnah*, so Allāh distinguishes the wicked from

the good. Islam does not know, O people, "the clique of profiteers"! Meaning always victory! *Mā shā’ Allāh*, we are all sweet like this and the beautiful sweet Islam which has no disturbances, no obstacles, no hindrances. No. This is Islam in their illusion. This is without obstacles in Paradise, *In shā’ Allāh*. As for on earth, there is no such thing.

Ibn Kathīr says: "And in this verse is a great intimidation against allying with disbelievers and abandoning allying with believers. And that this is from the attributes of hypocrites. And that Faith requires loving the believers and allying with them, and hating the disbelievers and showing enmity to them." This is *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’*, and this is the *Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* which has eroded, almost become extinct, and was diluted in our days. These are the concepts absent from the common people, indeed absent from students of knowledge unfortunately.

Therefore, Allāh the Exalted says in the other verse which we will review, look at the condition of these people:

تَرَىٰ كَثِيرًا مِّنْهُمْ يَتَوَلَّوْنَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ۚ لَبِئْسَ مَا قَدَّمَتْ لَهُمْ أَنفُسُهُمْ أَن سَخِطَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِمْ وَفِي الْعَذَابِ هُمْ خَالِدُونَ

"You see many of them becoming allies of those who disbelieved. How wretched is that which they have put forth for themselves in that Allah has become angry with them, and in the punishment they will abide eternally." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 80]

You see many of them becoming allies of those who disbelieved through love, *Muwālāh*, following, and support. "How wretched is that which they have put forth for themselves." This verse is in [Sūrah Al-Mā’idah, verse number 80].

As the scholar Al-Sa‘dī says: "This stagnant merchandise and losing deal, which is the anger of Allāh the Exalted 'Allah has become angry with them,' and eternal abiding for them in the great punishment. Their souls have wronged them as they presented for them this ignoble lodging, and they wronged themselves as they made them miss the enduring bliss," those who allied with these disbelievers and followed them.

So this is a false claim when they say: "We, O people, are believers. Praise be to Allāh, we are very beautiful." Okay, my brother, come look at the saying of the Exalted:

وَلَوْ كَانُوا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالنَّبِيِّ وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْهِ مَا اتَّخَذُوهُمْ أَوْلِيَاءَ وَلَكِنَّ كَثِيرًا مِّنْهُمْ فَاسِقُونَ

"And if they had believed in Allah and the Prophet and in what was revealed to him, they would not have taken them as allies; but many of them are defiantly disobedient." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 81]

This verse is number [81 in Sūrah Al-Mā’idah], directly after it.

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr said: "'And if they had believed in Allah and the Prophet and in what was revealed to him, they would not have taken them as allies'; meaning if they believed with true faith in Allāh, the Messenger, and the Quran, they would not have committed what they committed of allying with disbelievers internally and showing enmity to the believers in Allāh, the Prophet, and what Allāh revealed. 'But many of them are defiantly disobedient.'"

Therefore, the scholar Al-Sa‘dī also says: "For Faith in Allāh, the Prophet, and what was revealed to him requires the slave to ally with his Lord and ally with His allies, and show enmity to whoever disbelieved in Him and showed enmity to Him, and hastened into His disobedience. So the condition of the *Wilāyah* of Allāh and Faith in Him is not taking the enemies of Allāh as allies. And the condition was not found in these people, which indicates the negation of the conditioned (*Mashrūṭ*). 'But many of them are defiantly disobedient'; meaning exiting from the obedience of Allāh, and from Faith in Him and the Prophet. And among their defiance (*Fisq*) is allying with the enemies of Allāh." What is the cause of their *Fisq*? Not because they drink alcohol; rather, this is *Fisq* of another type, *Fisq* for the reason of *Muwālāh*.

Therefore, Sheikh Ismā‘īl Ḥaqqī says in *Rūḥ al-Bayān*, and Sheikh Ismā‘īl Ḥaqqī died in the year 1227 AH, and his Tafsīr has some issues (*Kalām*), but let us leave that for now. The point is he infers saying: "And the third [point] is that the believer and the disbeliever are not of one genus. And allying with the disbeliever necessitates the anger of Allāh, because allying with enemies necessitates enmity towards allies, it is an equation. So it behooves the believer [seeking] complete *Muwālāh* to cut himself off from the companionship of disbelievers, wicked people, people of innovation and desires, and masters of heedlessness and denial."

And Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* says:

أَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ أَن تُتْرَكُوا وَلَمَّا يَعْلَمِ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ جَاهَدُوا مِنكُمْ وَلَمْ يَتَّخِذُوا مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَا رَسُولِهِ وَلَا الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَلِيجَةً ۚ وَاللَّهُ خَبِيرٌ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ

"Do you think that you will be left [as you are] while Allah has not yet made evident those among you who strive [for His cause] and do not take other than Allah, His Messenger and the believers as intimates? And Allah is Acquainted with what you do." [QS. Al-Tawbah: 16]

Ismā'īl Ḥaqqī also says in *Rūḥ al-Bayān*: "In the verse is a clarification that the sincere believer avoids the disbeliever and the hypocrite and does not take them as two companions of secrets. This instruction is a special instruction, and the elite have inherited it from him, peace be upon him, until this day, and the commoners have not become aware of it. And he did not divulge their secrets to foreigners, for that is treachery. Likewise, the alliance of a believer to a disbeliever and his love for him is treachery. And mixing is only from the love of Kufr, and refuge is sought with Allāh the Exalted." He considers divulging these secrets to disbelievers, and the alliance of a believer to a disbeliever, as treachery. And that mixing is caused by socializing with disbelievers, because you will love him and feel comfortable with him, so affection comes from here.

Therefore, Allāh the Exalted says in the verse which is another evidence:

وَلَا تَرْكَنُوا إِلَى الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا فَتَمَسَّكُمُ النَّارُ وَمَا لَكُم مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ مِنْ أَوْلِيَاءَ ثُمَّ لَا تُنصَرُونَ

"And do not incline toward those who do wrong, lest you be touched by the Fire, and you would not have other than Allah any protectors; then you would not be helped." [QS. Hūd: 113]

Notice: "And do not incline." Merely inclining (*Rukūn*), not action! *Rukūn* means one leaning on something, or close to it. But "And do not incline toward those who do wrong, lest you be touched by the Fire." So the Exalted mentioned, as the scholar Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*, says: "That inclining toward the oppressors among the disbelievers and wrongdoers necessitates the touch of the Fire. He did not differentiate between one who feared them and others, except the

coerced one. So what then of he who made inclining toward them a religion and a good opinion?!"

There are many in our time among the scholars who ascribe themselves to this religion who deem inclining toward them good fundamentally!! And clarify their praiseworthy qualities!

So he says: "He did not differentiate between one who feared them and others, except the coerced one. So what then of he who made inclining toward them a religion and a good opinion, and aided them with what he was capable of regarding money and opinion, and loved the removal of Tawḥīd?" By Allāh, there are some who ascribe themselves to the Shari'ah who love the removal of Tawḥīd! The removal of the State of Islam, the removal of Shari'ah, because Islamic Shari'ah is a protection for the sanctity of Tawḥīd. In Islam, we have: "Indeed, my prayer, my rites of sacrifice, my living and my dying are for Allah, Lord of the worlds." From the cradle to the grave, from obligation to death. There are people who do not love that, and ascribe themselves falsely but do not declare it. They ascribe themselves in name only to Islam but do not examine. These people are called *Zanādiqah* (Heretics); he conceals other than what he reveals.

"So what then of he who made inclining toward them a religion and a good opinion, and aided them with what he was capable of regarding money and opinion, and loved the removal of Tawḥīd and its people, and the dominance of the people of Shirk over them?! For this is among the greatest Kufr and Inclining (*Rukūn*)." Imagine some of these who ascribe themselves to this Millah "And do not incline toward those who do wrong" aid them!! Meaning incite them to occupy Muslim lands! Aid them with money as happens in American elections and others. Among them are those who give them money to establish channels to destroy the identity of the *Ummah*, as in specific channels you know which are in Arabic. These satellite stations are also funded from the pockets of Muslims! By those who ascribe themselves to this Millah! With the intent of spreading obscenity and vice; they love for immorality to spread, and they love for Kufr to spread among the children of Muslims. This is from the money of the children of Muslims! So this is the verse.

In shā' Allāh, we will stop at this amount of the lecture today, and we will complete the rest of the evidences *In shā' Allāh* from the Book and Sunnah later, then from the Prophetic Sīrah. Then we will enter into the subjects as I told you successively, according to the methodology I read to you before, and praise be to Allāh.

I say this statement of mine and ask Allāh for forgiveness for me and for you.

I hope I have conveyed the idea to you as much as possible. We ask Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*, the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to teach us what benefits us, and to make these words of ours blessed by the permission of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* and to make them an expiation for us and for you. May Allāh bless you.

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Fourth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allāh from the evils of our souls and the bad consequences of our deeds. Whomever Allāh guides, there is none to misguide him, and whomever He leaves astray, there is none to guide him. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Honored brothers everywhere, *Al-salāmu ‘alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh*.

Here we are with the fourth lesson among the lessons of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* (Loyalty and Disavowal) or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* (Alliance and Enmity). *In shā’ Allāh*, today we will complete the Shar‘ī evidences on the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* or *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’*. Before I complete the Shar‘ī evidences, I would like to remind you that in the past sessions we undertook the definition of *Al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* from the linguistic aspect and also from the Shar‘ī aspect (terminologically). We concluded that the meanings of *Al-Muwālāh* all revolve approximately around support, agreement, following, obedience, affection, and love, and that all these meanings signify *Al-Muwālāh*.

We also said that the *Muwālāh* obligatory according to Shari'ah is for the Muslim to direct these meanings to Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* and the *Muwālāh* prohibited according to Shari'ah is to direct these meanings to the disbelievers, polytheists, and other than Allāh. So affection, support, agreement, following, obedience, affection, and love; all of this is for Allāh. We spoke about this subject in detail. We also reviewed after that the Shar‘ī evidences from the Holy Quran, and we are still reviewing the Shar‘ī evidences from the Holy Quran. Therefore, I want to emphasize also that we will speak on the subjects we proposed; we will speak about the effective cause of Takfīr (*Manāṭ al-Takfīr*) in *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*, and this problem which some always raise. We will delve into, speak about, and enter this issue, *In shā’ Allāh*, and we will speak about it in detail and edit/refine (*Nuḥarriruhā*) it in detail, *In shā’ Allāh*.

And we will speak, as we told you in the first lecture for those who did not listen to us before, we will speak about the ruling on the spy in Islam, and the story of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* and we will also speak about the issue of naturalization and citizenship, and some other issues related to this subject; such as coercion

(*Ikrāh*) and its relationship to *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. We will speak about *Taqiyyah* (precaution/dissimulation), and speak about *Mudāhanah* (flattery/compromise), and about *Mudārah* (diplomacy/gentleness). And *In shā' Allāh*, we will speak about the evils (corruptions) of allying with disbelievers, and we will speak about forms of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* throughout history. This, *In shā' Allāh*, will be in the coming lectures, but the matter requires patience.

Some brothers sent me messages asking about the issue of *Al-Muwālāh* and the divisions; the division of *Al-Muwālāh* into Major and Minor. This is what is common and famous, especially since the scholars of the Najdi Call, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhim*, despite their strictness in these issues and their holding fast to the Sunnah, they are the ones who divided it into Major *Muwālāh* and Minor *Muwālāh*. This is what caused confusion and caused many problems for those who address these issues. So they began relying on some scholars of the Najdi Call in dividing *Al-Muwālāh* or dividing *Al-Walā'*. They collected the forms of all dealings with disbelievers and divided them into two parts: Major *Muwālāh* and Minor *Muwālāh*. But in reality, there are dealings with disbelievers that have no relation to *Al-Muwālāh* fundamentally.

Meaning it is not *Muwālāh* in reality; it is another form, but the scholars placed it under the circle or section of *Al-Muwālāh*, so this is what caused the ambiguity. Otherwise, *Al-Muwālāh* in the terminological and linguistic sense would contradict these forms we mentioned; because there are forms in dealing with disbelievers like buying and selling and others, which they placed in *Al-Muwālāh* as well, so this is the cause of ambiguity in this issue. We will refine it, *In shā' Allāh*, in the issue of the effective cause of Kufr (*Manāṭ al-Kufr*) in *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*. But I would like the minds to be clear that this division is a recent division, a new division. Those who originated this were some weak-souled individuals among the defeated and crushed scholars. What did they do?

They exploited this division, even though the scholars of the Najdi Call did not have this subject in mind, like Sheikh Ibn 'Atīq and others, and Sheikh Sulaymān and all those; they did not have in mind this decline and collapse. However, what happened is that they exploited the division and placed forms that are fundamentally not placed in the division... they placed Major *Muwālāh* into Minor *Muwālāh*, and fumbled in these issues claiming that *Al-Muwālāh* is two parts; a Major part and a Minor part. We will clarify this, that not every form of *Muwālāh* in the true sense is *Muwālāh* [in the technical sense of Kufr]. *Al-Muwālāh* or *Al-Walā'* in the terminological sense or Shar'ī sense or the meaning close to the linguistic one as well...

this *Muwālāh* is the True *Muwālāh* which is Major Kufr or expels from the Millah. It differs from the forms some scholars placed and said were Minor *Muwālāh*; this is only its name, as if it is a form of *Muwālāh*, but in reality, it is not of *Al-Muwālāh*. We will refine the issue later in detail, *In shā’ Allāh*, but all this we do as what is called "preparing the souls" to comprehend the issues in detail, *In shā’ Allāh*, so that some do not chase us saying "When will we listen to these matters?" We are progressing gradually.

We come to the eleventh evidence, these verses are evidences, so we consider every verse an evidence in itself. Among the evidences on the subject of study which we are addressing (the subject of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*) is the saying of Allāh the Exalted in Sūrah Hūd:

وَلَا تَرْكَنُوا إِلَى الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا فَتَمَسَّكُمُ النَّارُ وَمَا لَكُم مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ مِنْ أَوْلِيَاءَ ثُمَّ لَا تُنصَرُونَ

> "And do not incline toward those who do wrong, lest you be touched by the Fire, and you would not have other than Allah any protectors; then you would not be helped." [QS. Hūd: 113]

This verse, as Abū Ḥayyān said in *Al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*: "The meaning of *Al-Rukūn* (Inclining) is leaning/tilting (*Mayl*)." Mere leaning. He says: "'Do not incline' means do not lean toward those who do wrong." This is in *Al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*. Therefore, he said: "So accompanying them, sitting with them, visiting them, compromising with them (*Mudāhanah*), being pleased with their actions, resembling them, dressing in their fashion, extending the eye to their splendor, and mentioning them with what contains glorification of them. Contemplate His saying, Exalted is He: 'And do not incline (*lā tarkanū*),' for *Al-Rukūn* is slight leaning. And His saying: 'toward those who do wrong' (*ila alladhīna ẓalamū*), meaning toward those from whom wrongdoing (*Ẓulm*) was found, and He did not say 'the wrongdoers' (*Al-Ẓālimīn*)." So imagine this merely inclining, meaning slight leaning toward those from whom wrongdoing was found! So what about those described as wrongdoers?! The prohibition is more severe in this case.

The scholar Al-Sa‘dī also says regarding this verse "And do not incline toward those who do wrong": "In this verse is a warning against inclining toward every wrongdoer. The intent of inclining is leaning and joining him in his wrongdoing, agreeing with him on that, and being pleased with the wrongdoing he is upon. If this threat is for inclining toward the wrongdoers, then what is the state of the wrongdoers themselves! We ask Allāh for safety from wrongdoing."

Imām Al-Qurṭubī says: "'And do not incline'; *Al-Rukūn* is in reality leaning/relying upon, depending, resting towards a thing, and being pleased with it. It means do not show them affection, do not obey them, do not lean toward them, do not be pleased with their actions. All these meanings are close." He says: "The correct meaning is that this verse indicates shunning (*Hijrān*) the people of Kufr and sins among the people of innovation and others." Meaning Al-Qurṭubī infers from it the shunning of the people of Kufr and sins among the people of innovation and others. "For accompanying them is Kufr or sin, since companionship only arises from affection (*Mawaddah*), and it is among the meanings of *Al-Walā'*. Excepted from this is only one case, which is the case of *Taqiyyah*", which we will speak about, *In shā' Allāh*, later in another lecture, meaning the single exception is *Taqiyyah* from the wrongdoer, meaning for necessity and compulsion in specific cases we will speak about, *In shā' Allāh*.

And Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* says: "lest you be touched by the Fire." Look at this severe warning. "Lest you be touched by the Fire, meaning it burns you due to mixing with them, accompanying them, aiding them (*Mumāla'ah*) in their turning away, and agreeing with them in their affairs."

People in our time now take lightly accompanying wrongdoers, and accompanying those stubborn against Islam, indeed accompanying mockers!! He accompanies him, and that does not prevent him from being his eating companion and drinking companion. You find people accompanying these people, saying "This is my brother in Parliament!" "This is my brother in the Shura Council!" "This is my brother in the Constituent Assembly!" You find these are among the stubborn ones; some are Christians, some are disbelievers, some have no relation [to religion], meaning among the people most severe in enmity. Despite that, this does not prevent him from being his eating companion, drinking companion, beloved, and close friend, and showing him affection. He says: "Difference of opinion does not spoil the affection in the matter!!" Naturally, this is false speech and is not permissible to be said. This is Creed. One fights Shari'ah and you say "Difference of opinion"! No, this spoils.

Difference in Creed spoils the relationship, and spoils affection. This necessitates cutting off ties, necessitates enmity, necessitates that I show enmity to this criminal and denounce him, and criticize him. You consider Shari'ah merely an opinion?! Therefore you ally with him and assist him? Some say: "We form alliances," an Islamic alliance with a secularist... etc. Alliances mean *Muwālāh*; they ally with each other. This *Muwālāh* contains the helper, the supporter, the close friend, affection, and love. All this is prohibited according to Shari'ah and impermissible;

because prohibited *Muwālāh*, as I told you, among its meanings is that it is directed to other than Allāh; meaning directing support, love, affection, and proximity. All this being directed to other than Allāh is Ḥarām.

Another Evidence, which is the Twelfth Evidence, we categorize it as an arrangement of verses, is the saying of Allāh the Exalted:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا الْيَهُودَ وَالنَّصَارَىٰ أَوْلِيَاءَ ۘ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلِيَاءُ بَعْضٍ ۚ وَمَن يَتَوَلَّهُم مِّنكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْهُمْ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ * فَتَرَى الَّذِينَ فِي قُلُوبِهِم مَّرَضٌ يُسَارِعُونَ فِيهِمْ يَقُولُونَ نَخْشَىٰ أَن تُصِيبَنَا دَائِرَةٌ ۚ فَعَسَى اللَّهُ أَن يَأْتِيَ بِالْفَتْحِ أَوْ أَمْرٍ مِّنْ عِندِهِ فَيُصْبِحُوا عَلَىٰ مَا أَسَرُّوا فِي أَنفُسِهِمْ نَادِمِينَ * وَيَقُولُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَهَٰؤُلَاءِ الَّذِينَ أَقْسَمُوا بِاللَّهِ جَهْدَ أَيْمَانِهِمْ ۙ إِنَّهُمْ لَمَعَكُمْ ۚ حَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ فَأَصْبَحُوا خَاسِرِينَ

> "O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people. So you see those in whose hearts is disease hastening into [association with] them, saying, 'We are afraid a misfortune may strike us.' But perhaps Allah will bring conquest or a decision from Him, and they will become, over what they have been concealing within themselves, regretful. And those who believe will say, 'Are these the ones who swore by Allah their strongest oaths that indeed they were with you?' Their deeds have become worthless, and they have become losers." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 51-53]

In the Tafsīr *Rūḥ al-Bayān* by the scholar Ismā‘īl Ḥaqqī, he says: "This is an address whose ruling encompasses all believers, the sincere and others. 'Do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies'; meaning do not take one of them as an ally, meaning do not show them pure affection nor cohabit with them the cohabitation of loved ones. Not meaning 'do not make them allies/guardians over you in reality,' for that is a matter impossible in itself and the prohibition does not relate to it. 'They are allies of one another'; meaning some of each group of those two groups are allies. Some are allies of others, not of the other group, because there is no alliance between the two groups of Jews and Christians fundamentally. All agree

on Kufr and agree on harming you, so how can an alliance be imagined between you and them? 'And whoever is an ally to them among you'; meaning whoever takes them as allies. 'Then indeed, he is [one] of them'; meaning he is upon their religion and with them in the Fire."

Ismā'īl Ḥaqqī was a scholar in the days of the Ottoman Empire. Although he has a Sufi inclination, he has very strong words in issues of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*. Would that the Sufis in our days were like this man!

He said: "Therefore Abū Al-Sa'ūd says in his Tafsīr —and he was one of his Sheikhs—: 'And in it is a severe rebuke against showing the form of *Muwālāh* to them even if it is not *Muwālāh* in reality. "Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people" is a justification for the state of he who allies with them being of them; meaning He does not guide those who wronged themselves by abandoning their believing brothers and allying with the enemies of Allāh. Rather, He leaves them to their affair, so they fall into Kufr and misguidance. O Allāh, do not leave me to myself for the blink of an eye.'"

We are now still with the interpretation of verses [51-53] of Sūrah Al-Mā'idah.

"Allāh the Exalted says: 'Saying, "We are afraid a misfortune may strike us."' 'But perhaps Allah will bring conquest': A refutation from the side of Allāh the Exalted for their false excuses."

People make excuses with reasons that are false in themselves. "Saying, 'We are afraid a misfortune may strike us'": They might gain power over us later, strike us, cut us off, and besiege us. So Allāh clarified that these excuses are false. It is "a cutting off of their empty ambitions and glad tidings to the believers of victory. For 'Perhaps' (*'Asā*) from Allāh *Subḥānah* is a definite promise." When Allāh says "But perhaps Allah will bring conquest" after the Muslim adheres to these conditions, controls, and prohibitions, then *'Asā* here means realization (*Taḥqīq*), meaning the definite promise that it will inevitably happen by the permission of Allāh.

Therefore the exegetes said: "But perhaps Allah will bring conquest": The conquest meant here is the Conquest of Mecca, and this happened. And the conquest of the villages of the Jews of Khaybar, and it happened. Or it is the decisive judgment by His victory for him, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, that Allāh gave him victory later, and his Companions conquered the lands, and conquered the world. All this is "But perhaps Allah will bring conquest," and the definite promise came when they

fulfilled these conditions and allied for the sake of Allāh and showed enmity for the sake of Allāh.

He also narrates a story regarding the saying of Allāh the Exalted: "Are these the ones who swore by Allah their strongest oaths that indeed they were with you? Their deeds have become worthless, and they have become losers." This is upon the appearance of the regret of the hypocrites. He narrates a story about them in this subject: "O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies." He says that his Sheikh visited Damascus in that time and found a strange thing; he found that men and women were allying with Christians, being lenient in dealing, taking their children and young ones to churches, and sprinkling on them, by way of seeking blessing, seeking blessing with this water of baptism. And this is Kufr, and refuge is sought with Allāh, this is the speech of Ismā‘īl Ḥaqqī in *Rūḥ al-Bayān*, he says: "And this is Kufr, and refuge is sought with Allāh. Baptism is yellow water of the Christians in which they used to dip their children, believing it is purification for the newborn like circumcision for others. Analogize upon this the veneration of the Christians' Nayruz, gifting something to them on that day, and participating with them. It is necessary to reinstate *Ḥisbah* (enjoining good and forbidding evil) in some matters to decisively cut the vein of *Muwālāh*."

He found that people go to churches, take this water, bring their children, and baptize them at this time. Glory be to Allāh! Also he says that it is obligatory on the believer to show *Muwālāh* [to believers] and prevent these polytheists even from bringing in and displaying these alcohols in the streets. This was happening unfortunately in Damascus at that time.

We come to the Thirteenth Evidence. Allāh the Exalted says:

وَلَا يَزَالُونَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ حَتَّىٰ يَرُدُّوكُمْ عَن دِينِكُمْ إِنِ اسْتَطَاعُوا ۚ وَمَن يَرْتَدِدْ مِنكُمْ عَن دِينِهِ فَيَمُتْ وَهُوَ كَافِرٌ فَأُولَٰئِكَ حَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ ۖ وَأُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ ۖ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ

"And they will not cease fighting you until they turn you back from your religion if they are able. And whoever of you reverts from his religion [to disbelief] and dies while he is a disbeliever - for those, their deeds have become worthless in this world and the Hereafter, and those are the companions of the Fire, they will abide therein eternally." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 217]

Imām Al-Sa‘dī says: "Then the Exalted informed that they will not cease fighting the believers, and their purpose is not regarding their wealth

and killing them, but their purpose is to turn them back from their religion, and for them to be disbelievers after their faith until they become of the companions of the Blaze. So they exert their ability in that, striving with whatever is possible for them. But Allāh refuses except to perfect His light, although the disbelievers dislike it. This description is general for all disbelievers; they do not cease fighting others until they turn them back from their religion, especially the People of the Book among Jews and Christians who established associations, spread missionaries, dispatched doctors, and built schools to attract nations to their religion and introduce to them whatever possible of doubts (*Shubah*)."

Meaning they introduce doubts and make the Muslim skeptical about his religion.

"But what is hoped from Allāh the Exalted, who bestowed Islam upon the believers, chose His upright religion for them, and perfected His religion for them, is that He completes His blessing upon them by their establishing it most completely, and that He forsakes everyone who wanted to extinguish His light, turns their plot against their own throats, supports His religion, and elevates His word. This verse is true regarding these existing disbelievers just as it was true regarding those before them. 'Indeed, those who disbelieve spend their wealth to avert [people] from the way of Allah. So they will spend it; then it will be for them a [source of] regret; then they will be overcome. And those who have disbelieved - unto Hell they will be gathered.' [QS. Al-Anfāl: 36] Then the Exalted informed that whoever apostatized from Islam by choosing Kufr over it and continued on that until he died as a disbeliever: 'For those, their deeds have become worthless in this world and the Hereafter' due to the absence of its condition, which is Islam. 'And those are the companions of the Fire, they will abide therein eternally.' The verse indicates by its concept that whoever apostatized from it then returned to Islam, his deed which was before his apostasy returns to him. Likewise, whoever repented from sins, his previous deeds return to him."

This is a jurisprudential issue among scholars: Does his deed return to him if he returns? Sheikh Al-Sa'dī held the view, based on the concept of the verse, that his deed which he did before (righteous deed) returns to him.

Al-Shawkānī says in *Fatḥ al-Qadīr*: "This verse 'And they will not cease fighting you until they turn you back from your religion if they are able' is an indication of the permanence of the enmity of the People of the Book toward the Muslims, and that they do not detach from it in any condition, and [an indication of] the hardening of Muslims in the religion

and the firmness of their foothold in it; as if it was said: 'How can they achieve that?'" So the permanence of the enmity of the People of the Book also implies another permanence for the firmness of a group of Muslims; that Muslims also remain firm. So if the issue is that their enmity is continuous, then there are also Muslims whose enmity towards disbelievers is also continuous and firm.

We come to the Fourteenth Evidence. Allāh the Exalted says:

اللَّهُ وَلِيُّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا يُخْرِجُهُم مِّنَ الظُّلُمَاتِ إِلَى النُّورِ ۖ وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا أَوْلِيَاؤُهُمُ الطَّاغُوتُ يُخْرِجُونَهُم مِّنَ النُّورِ إِلَى الظُّلُمَاتِ ۗ أُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ ۖ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ

"Allah is the ally of those who believe. He brings them out from darknesses into the light. And those who disbelieve - their allies are Taghut. They take them out of the light into darknesses. Those are the companions of the Fire; they will abide eternally therein." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 257]

The scholar Al-Kattānī said in *Al-Dawāhī al-Mudhiyyah*, quoting from the book *'Uddat al-Umarā'* and the Rulers, quoting from *Al-Sayf al-Battār*, these are books by scholars of the Maghrib: "This verse implies that people are two parts; those who believe, their Ally is Allāh the Exalted, none other. So they have no *Mawlā* other than Allāh and His Messenger ('Allāh is our *Mawlā* and you have no *Mawlā*'). 'And those who disbelieve - their allies are Taghut.' So there is no intermediary; whoever takes Taghut as an ally instead of Allāh has lost a clear loss and committed a grave matter. There is only the Ally of Allāh or the Ally of Taghut, and no partnership in any way whatsoever." There are no half-solutions here; either you are an ally of Allāh or an ally of Taghut. Partnership or mediator does not work.

We move to the Fifteenth Evidence. Evidence here means the verse; I divide it into evidences so matters are easy. Allāh the Exalted said:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِن تُطِيعُوا الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا يَرُدُّوكُمْ عَلَىٰ أَعْقَابِكُمْ فَتَنقَلِبُوا خَاسِرِينَ

"O you who have believed, if you obey those who disbelieve, they will turn you back on your heels, and you will [then] become losers." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 149]

The scholar Sulaymān b. ʻAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʻAbd al-Wahhāb (the grandson) said: "The Exalted informed that if the believers obey the disbelievers, they must inevitably turn them back on their heels from Islam, for they will not be satisfied with them without Kufr. He informed that if they do that, they become losers in this world and the Hereafter. He did not grant a concession to agree with them and obey them out of fear of them, there is no concession for them in this way, and this is the reality, for those who agree with them will not satisfy them except by testifying that they are on the truth, showing enmity and hatred to the Muslims, and cutting off the hand from them. Then the Exalted said: 'But Allah is your protector, and He is the best of helpers.' [QS. Āl ʻImrān: 150] So the Exalted informed that Allāh is the protector of the believers and their helper, and He is the best of helpers. So in His *Wilāyah* and obedience is sufficiency and adequacy over obeying the disbeliever. So oh, regret for the slaves who knew Tawḥīd."

He expresses regret for the people who knew Tawḥīd, grew up in it, and professed it, yet despite that exited from the *Wilāyah* of the Lord of the Worlds and the Best of Helpers to the polytheistic problems that were in his time, to the *Wilāyah* of domes and their people. "They were pleased with it instead of the *Wilāyah* of Him in whose hand is the dominion of everything. 'Wretched is the exchange for the wrongdoers.'" This is the speech of Sheikh Sulaymān in his book *Al-Dalā'il fī Ḥukm Muwālāt Ahl al-Ishrāk*.

The scholar Al-Saʻdī said regarding the two verses as well: "This is a prohibition from Allāh to the believers against obeying the disbelievers among hypocrites and polytheists. For if they obey them, they intend nothing for them but evil. Their intent is to return them to Kufr whose consequence is failure and loss."

Therefore, I comment and say: This is the speech of our Lord, and who is more truthful than Allāh in statement?! Allāh says: "O you who have believed, if you obey those who disbelieve, they will turn you back on your heels, and you will [then] become losers." Meaning if you obey America, by Allāh, you will harvest nothing but loss, and you will harvest nothing but clear loss. Notice those who obeyed the West and East, the Muslims who obeyed Communism in the past, what happened to them? Muslim countries were destroyed.

Those who allied with Communism in South Yemen, what happened? Brother killed brother without anything. Muslim killing Muslim. They shed blood and claimed lives for the sake of Marx, for the sake of Lenin, for the sake of Socialism 1 and Socialism 2, and they became

quarreling partners. The Communist system collapsed, whether the Communist Party in Iraq or the parties that rode Marxism with Nationalism with Regionalism and all the "isms" (*Allatī wa al-Latī*) like these ideas; they all collapsed. The Baath in Iraq with the Baath in Syria with Arab Nationalisms, and all the ruin and destruction that happened due to this *Muwālāh*.

When they resorted to America and the West, nothing befell them but loss and destruction. America became like Hellfire saying: "Is there any more?" Whenever you concede anything to it, it says to you: "Is there any more?" This is not enough. The more you abandon Islam, the more pleasing you become to them. So whoever follows them, allies with them, draws near to them, supports them, and shows them affection... even if you claim you do not love them but you ally with them and aid them. It is not a condition for the one who allies that all meanings gather in him; even one meaning is sufficient. We say these are among its meanings. You say "I do not love America but I cooperate with it." Cooperate with it in what?! Cooperate with it in excluding Islamic Shari'ah from governance?! In warring against Muslims?! Cooperate with them in striking the monotheist Muslims in Sinai and elsewhere, in Gaza, and besieging Muslims in Iraq and Afghanistan and so on?!

He says "I do not love America." Well, you are a supporter of it, you are an aider of it, you are a backer (*Muẓāhir*) of it, you are a follower of it, you execute its projects!!

Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* says immediately after this verse in [Verse 150 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān]: "But Allah is your protector, and He is the best of helpers." He is your Helper, He is your Supporter, He is the one you should show affection to and whom you should love. However, unfortunately, they say only as a claim: "We hate America in the media, we do not love America in the media", and now they do not even say that. I am recounting when they used to say it. But in reality, most Shar‘ī and linguistic meanings of the concept of *Muwālāh* are realized in them by the evidences, context clues, and proofs we live and know.

We come to another evidence, the Sixteenth Evidence in the saying of Allāh the Exalted:

وَنَادَىٰ نُوحٌ رَّبَّهُ فَقَالَ رَبِّ إِنَّ ابْنِي مِنْ أَهْلِي وَإِنَّ وَعْدَكَ الْحَقُّ
وَأَنتَ أَحْكَمُ الْحَاكِمِينَ * قَالَ يَا نُوحُ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ أَهْلِكَ ۖ إِنَّهُ عَمَلٌ

غَيْرُ صَالِحٍ ۖ فَلَا تَسْأَلْنِ مَا لَيْسَ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمٌ ۖ إِنِّي أَعِظُكَ أَن تَكُونَ مِنَ الْجَاهِلِينَ

"And Noah called to his Lord and said, 'My Lord, indeed my son is of my family; and indeed, Your promise is true; and You are the most just of judges!' He said, 'O Noah, indeed he is not of your family; indeed, he is [one whose] work was other than righteous, so ask Me not for that about which you have no knowledge. Indeed, I advise you, lest you be among the ignorant.'" [QS. Hūd: 45-46]

Abū Ḥayyān said in *Al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*: "His saying 'Indeed my son is of my family': It is apparent that he is his biological son. The meaning of 'of my family': meaning those whom I was commanded, O Lord, to carry in the ship. Because Allāh commanded him with His saying: 'Load upon the ship of each [creature] two mates and your family' as in Sūrah Hūd. He did not think that he was included among those Allāh excepted by His saying: 'except those against whom the word has preceded among them,' because he thought he was a believer." He says that Noah, peace be upon him, thought his son was excepted from this because he thought his son was a believer. And Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* answered Noah that Allāh is aware of his son that he is not a believer and that he is a disbeliever. Prophet of Allāh Noah interpreted this verse "Load upon the ship of each [creature] two mates and your family," so he thought he was of his family. Some scholars said: Perhaps he thought "of your family" meant believer and non-believer, so out of compassion he said it. Others say no, he thought his son was a believer; he did not know his son was a disbeliever.

Therefore, Al-Qurṭubī said in his commentary on this verse: "Noah would not have said to his Lord 'Indeed my son is of my family' unless that was the case with him (in his view), since it is impossible that he ask for the destruction of the disbelievers..." If Master Noah, peace be upon him, thought his son was a believer... otherwise Master Noah says: "My Lord, do not leave upon the earth from among the disbelievers an inhabitant." He supplicates against the disbelievers and excepts his son?! So he said no, he did not know his son was a disbeliever; he knew (thought) his son was a believer.

"Therefore Allāh replied to him with that. His son used to conceal Kufr and show Faith. So Allāh the Exalted informed Noah of what He alone possesses of knowledge of the Unseen; meaning 'I knew of the condition of your son what you did not know.'" Therefore Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* replied to him that this son would be among the drowned. This speech was also mentioned by the scholar Al-Sa'dī and others, but all

speech revolves around the words of Al-Qurṭubī, Ibn ‘Aṭiyyah, and also Abū Ḥayyān and these scholars.

Naturally, when I speak on the interpretation of a verse, I summarize very briefly. I speak only to fit the lesson time so we do not prolong it for you.

There is another evidence we take, which is the Seventeenth Evidence, His saying, Exalted is He, in [Sūrah Al-Naḥl Verse number 36]:

وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِي كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَّسُولًا أَنِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَاجْتَنِبُوا الطَّاغُوتَ ۖ فَمِنْهُم مَّنْ هَدَى اللَّهُ وَمِنْهُم مَّنْ حَقَّتْ عَلَيْهِ الضَّلَالَةُ ۚ فَسِيرُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ فَانظُرُوا كَيْفَ كَانَ عَاقِبَةُ الْمُكَذِّبِينَ

"And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], 'Worship Allah and avoid Taghut.' And among them were those whom Allah guided, and among them were those upon whom error was [deservedly] decreed. So proceed through the earth and observe how was the end of the deniers." [QS. Al-Naḥl: 36]

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr said: "'And We certainly sent into every nation' meaning in every generation and group of people 'a messenger', and all of them call to the worship of Allāh and forbid the worship of other than Him. Meaning: Worship Allāh and avoid Taghut. The Exalted continued sending Messengers to people with that since Shirk occurred among the Children of Adam in the people of Noah, to whom Noah was sent, and he was the first Messenger Allāh sent to the people of earth, until He sealed them with Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* whose call covered humans and jinn in the Easts and Wests. All of them as the Exalted said: 'And We sent not before you any messenger except that We revealed to him that, "There is no deity except Me, so worship Me."' [QS. Al-Anbyā’: 25] And His saying, Exalted is He: 'And ask those We sent before you of Our messengers; have We made besides the Most Merciful deities to be worshipped?' [QS. Al-Zukhruf: 45] And the Exalted said in this verse from Sūrah Al-Naḥl: 'And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], "Worship Allah and avoid Taghut."' So how is it permissible for any of the polytheists to say: 'If Allah had willed, we would not have worshipped anything other than Him' [QS. Al-Naḥl: 35]? For His Shar‘ī Will is negated regarding them because He forbade them from that on the tongues of His Messengers. As for His Cosmic Will (*Mashī’ah Kawniyyah*), which is enabling them to do that by Decree (*Qadaran*), there is no argument for them in it. Because the Exalted created the Fire and its

people from devils and disbelievers, yet He is not pleased with Kufr for His slaves, and He has in that a reaching argument and decisive wisdom. Then the Exalted informed that He rebuked them with punishment in the world after the warning of the Messengers. Therefore He said: 'And among them were those whom Allah guided, and among them were those upon whom error was [deservedly] decreed. So proceed through the earth and observe how was the end of the deniers.' Meaning ask about what happened to the affair of those who opposed the Messengers and denied the truth: how Allāh destroyed them, and for the disbelievers is the like of it. So He said: 'Those before them denied, and how [terrible] was My reproach.'"

They argue in this Surah by the Will of Allāh, saying: If Allāh willed, we would not have worshipped them; they argue by *Qadar*. He says: If Allāh willed, I would not have killed him; if Allāh willed, I would not have disbelieved; if Allāh willed, I would not have disobeyed. This is a false argument and this is not permissible. If people argued with such silly claims, no one would be punished or held accountable. Why then did Allāh send Messengers?

So the Will of Allāh; there is a Cosmic Will (*Mashī'ah Kawniyyah*) for the disbeliever and the believer. As for the Shar'ī Will (*Mashī'ah Shar'iyyah*), this is the Will of Success (*Tawfīq*)/Guidance. Allāh gave them the faculty of choice: this is the path of Paradise and this is the path of the Blaze. They chose the path. They walked with their intellect like this to the other path, so Allāh does not grant them success. As for the believer, Allāh guides him to the Shar'ī Will (Will of Success) in the manner of "Guide us to the straight path." So we are guided, praise be to Allāh, from the aspect of Cosmic Guidance. But from the aspect of Shar'ī Guidance, this is additional guidance, which is the guidance that Allāh grants you success and inspires you. As for the disbeliever, he has no share in this verse.

Therefore Al-Sa'dī says: "That His argument was established against all nations, and that there is no nation, preceding or succeeding, but that Allāh sent a Messenger in it. All of them agreed on one call and one religion, which is the worship of Allāh alone having no partner 'Worship Allah and avoid Taghut.' So nations divided", the point here in this verse is that nations divided according to their response to the call of the Messengers and lack thereof into two parts, "Among them were those whom Allāh guided, so they followed the Messengers in knowledge and action. And among them were those upon whom error was decreed, so they followed the path of deviation. 'So proceed through the earth', meaning with your bodies and hearts, 'and observe how was the end of the deniers.' For

you will see those wonders, and you will not find a denier but that his end was destruction."

And Imām Al-Shanqīṭī has beautiful words in *Aḍwā’ al-Bayān*: "'And among them were those whom Allah guided, and among them were those upon whom error was [deservedly] decreed.' The nations in which Messengers were sent with Tawḥīd: among them is the happy (*Sa‘īd*) and among them is the wretched (*Shaqī*). The happy among them, Allāh guides him to follow what the Messengers brought. The wretched among them, the Book precedes against him, so he denies the Messengers and disbelieves in what they brought. So the call to the religion of Truth is general, and the success for guidance is specific", which is the Shar‘ī Will we are speaking about, meaning what is called the concept of Separation (*Mufāṣalah*), the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh*, "'And Allah invites to the Home of Peace and guides whom He wills to a straight path' [QS. Yūnus: 25]. So His saying 'And among them' meaning among the mentioned nations in His saying 'into every nation a messenger,' 'And among them were those whom Allah guided' meaning granted him success to follow what the Messengers brought. 'And among them were those upon whom error was [deservedly] decreed' meaning it became obligatory upon him and binding upon him because of what preceded in the knowledge of Allāh the Exalted that he would end up in wretchedness."

What is intended by error (*Ḍalālah*) here? The intent, as Al-Shanqīṭī says: "The intent here is departing from the path of Islam to Kufr. The Exalted has clarified this meaning in other verses as in His saying: 'It is He who created you, and among you is the disbeliever, and among you is the believer' [QS. Al-Taghābun: 2]. And His saying: 'And among them is the wretched and the happy' [QS. Hūd: 105]. And His saying: 'A party will be in Paradise and a party in the Blaze' [QS. Al-Shūrā: 7]. To other than that."

What is the relationship of this to the concept of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu‘ādāh* and evidences? It means that this is our Lord's division of people: among them is wretched and among them is happy, among them is disbeliever and among them is believer. So choose for yourself which of the two parties you will follow. This is the meaning of the evidence and the point from this evidence.

And His saying, Exalted is He, also in [Sūrah Al-Qaṣaṣ Verse number 17], His saying, Exalted is He, on the tongue of Prophet of Allāh Moses:

قَالَ رَبِّ بِمَا أَنْعَمْتَ عَلَيَّ فَلَنْ أَكُونَ ظَهِيرًا لِّلْمُجْرِمِينَ

"He said, 'My Lord, for the favor You have bestowed upon me, I will never be an assistant to the criminals.'" [QS. Al-Qaṣaṣ: 17]

Al-Sa'dī says: "'My Lord, for the favor You have bestowed upon me' meaning repentance, forgiveness, and many blessings. 'I will never be an assistant (*Ẓahīr*)'", the point here is in the word *Ẓahīr* which is among the meanings of *Muwālāh*, "meaning I will never be a helper and assistant to the criminals. Meaning I will not assist anyone in disobedience. This is a promise from Moses, peace be upon him, due to Allāh's favor upon him, that he will not assist a criminal as he did in killing the Copt. This implies that blessings require from the slave doing good and abandoning evil. 'He said, My Lord, for the favor You have bestowed upon me, I will never be an assistant to the criminals.'"

So whoever assists the Americans, comes with them, fights with them, works as a consultant for them, spies on the monotheists, guides them, and is a help to them is an assistant (*Ẓahīr*) to the criminals. He is an assistant to the disbelievers. He is an assistant to those who fight Islam and fight the creed of Muslims. "My Lord, for the favor You have bestowed upon me, I will never be an assistant to the criminals."

Therefore Allāh the Exalted also says later to His Messenger as well, this was to Moses, but to the Messenger of Allāh He says to him:

وَمَا كُنتَ تَرْجُو أَن يُلْقَىٰٓ إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابُ إِلَّا رَحْمَةً مِّن رَّبِّكَ ۖ فَلَا تَكُونَنَّ ظَهِيرًا لِّلْكَافِرِينَ

"And you were not expecting that the Book would be conveyed to you, but [it is] a mercy from your Lord. So do not be an assistant to the disbelievers." [QS. Al-Qaṣaṣ: 86]

In verse [17 in Sūrah Al-Qaṣaṣ] He mentioned: "An assistant to the criminals," and in this: "An assistant to the disbelievers." Assistant to the criminals because the incident was an incident of crime and killing "I will never be an assistant to the criminals." As for this, it is a general word for disbelievers "So do not be." Allāh forbids His Messenger from being an assistant to the disbelievers "So do not be an assistant to the disbelievers."

Therefore Ibn Kathīr says: "'And you were not expecting, O Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* that the Book would be conveyed to you,' meaning you did not think before the revelation of the Revelation to you that the Revelation would descend upon you. 'But [it is] a mercy from your Lord.' So separate from them, oppose them, and differ from them; meaning differ from these disbelievers and polytheists after the

Revelation descended upon you", meaning the Revelation in itself is a mercy and you did not originally think the Revelation would descend upon you, but the Revelation descended upon you so it is a mercy, therefore separate from them, oppose them, and differ from them, "Meaning the Revelation was sent down upon you from Allāh out of His mercy for you and the slaves. So if He granted you this great blessing, which is Revelation and Sending Down (The Holy Quran), then do not be a *Ẓahīr*, meaning a helper, to the disbelievers."

This is to the Messenger of Allāh, O people! Allāh forbids His Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, so what about his *Ummah*! What about us as well! So whoever is a helper to the disbelievers, polytheists, apostates, and warriors has fallen into this and is implicated by this verse. Allāh says: "So do not be an assistant to the disbelievers." So he is working now as an assistant to the disbelievers. He works with them and contradicts this verse.

Therefore Imām Al-Sa‘dī also says: "'So do not be an assistant to the disbelievers' meaning a helper to them in what they are upon of the branches of their Kufr. And among the totality of aiding them (*Muẓāharatihim*) is that it be said regarding something of it that it is contrary to wisdom, interest, and benefit."

Someone says: "This is wisdom. I am trying to show affection to them and reconcile their hearts." All this is false speech. How can you be an assistant to them, a helper to them against the Muslims?! How can you be an assistant to them and a helper to them in their wars against Islam, against the Creed, against Tawḥīd, and against the occupation of the lands of Islam?! And you tell me "I treat them gently and reconcile their hearts"! Reconcile their hearts in what, exactly?! They are the ones absorbing you, they are the ones reconciling you [to them], and they are the ones with whom you will melt, and your creed will melt with them.

His saying, Exalted is He:

وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَنفَعُهُمْ وَلَا يَضُرُّهُمْ ۗ وَكَانَ الْكَافِرُ عَلَىٰ رَبِّهِ ظَهِيرًا

"And they worship other than Allah that which does not benefit them or harm them, and the disbeliever is ever, against his Lord, an assistant [to Satan]." [QS. Al-Furqān: 55]

The point here from this verse, Ibn Kathīr said: "The Exalted informs about the ignorance of the polytheists in their worship of other than

Allāh of idols that possess for them neither harm nor benefit, with no evidence leading them to that nor argument guiding them to it; rather merely opinions, desire, and whims. So they ally with them, fight in their cause, and show enmity to Allāh, His Messenger, and the believers for them. Therefore the Exalted said: 'and the disbeliever is ever, against his Lord, an assistant (*Ẓahīr*)' meaning a helper in the path of Satan against the Party of Allāh, and the Party of Allāh are the predominant. As the Exalted said: 'And they have taken besides Allah [false] deities that perhaps they would be helped. They are not able to help them, and they [themselves] are for them soldiers in attendance.' [QS. Yā Sīn: 74-75]"

Those who take these soldiers; the European Union, NATO, and others among these, and the Americans and every Tom, Dick, and Harry for occupation... for example, there are now armies being mobilized in the region of Mali now in the Azawad region to occupy it. A world war against Islam, O people! Most of these neighboring countries are Islamic peoples; Mauritania, Algeria, Senegal, what is called West Africa. All these armies are now being mobilized, what is called the ECOWAS union, West African states. All these to mobilize more than one hundred fifty thousand or two hundred thousand soldiers in exchange for eradicating the root of Muslims there in the region of Azawad and Mali and rearranging. And those who will do that are soldiers named Muslims, O people!! His name is Muḥammad, ʻAlī, and Maḥmūd. By whose command? By the command of France, the command of America, the command of the European Union, and the command of the West, openly like this! They gave them a deadline of forty-five days. The Security Council intervened, yet these criminals did not intervene in Syria!

So this that is happening, this means being an assistant (*Ẓahīr*) to these criminals. "and the disbeliever is ever, against his Lord, an assistant." A helper aiding Satan, walking in the path of Satan against the Party of Allāh. The Party of Allāh are those monotheists and these Muslims despite their poverty, despite their weakness, and despite what they suffer. Who is being a helper to these armies? The one who will spend on these armies is the European Union, NATO spends on them, America spends on them, and the Security Council under what is called "International Legitimacy." And these soldiers are the ones fighting. America will not fight by itself; America will only be an umbrella of planes, it and France. The Americans "They will not fight you all except within fortified cities or from behind walls" [QS. Al-Ḥashr: 14]. They do not face Muslims face to face and do not want to lose in this. Otherwise, they would not have invented this drone (unmanned aerial vehicle) that harvests lives and destroys now.

So this drone, they will use it. Now it is used in Libya, and will be used in Tunisia after that, then used in Mali strongly now. And it is used now in Yemen, Somalia, and Afghanistan. Naturally, every day it harvests lives, and caravans of martyrs ascend to their Lord complaining of the injustice of the slaves, and the lack of support and lack of *Muwālāh* for these weak monotheists everywhere. Even here, those who do not fight and do not do anything, in Burma for example in the Arakan region and others; they are tortured openly, although they are not waging Jihad nor fighting them even, and they do not have any power (*Shawkah*) or strength. Despite that, these Muslims do not support them, nor ally with them, nor even do anything with them, especially the possessors of power, strength, money, and so on!!

So this "and the disbeliever is ever, against his Lord, an assistant." This disbeliever, as Ibn Kathīr says, is a helper in the path of Satan against the Party of Allāh. "And the Party of Allāh are the predominant. As the Exalted said: 'And they have taken besides Allah [false] deities that perhaps they would be helped. They are not able to help them, and they [themselves] are for them soldiers in attendance.' Meaning their deities they took besides Allāh do not possess victory for them. And these ignorant ones are soldiers in attendance for the idols, fighting for them and defending their domain. But the outcome and victory belong to Allāh, His Messenger, and the believers in this world and the Hereafter."

Those who believe that by their marching, backing (*Muẓāharah*), and allying with the American armies, Western armies, and these Crusader armies that came to Iraq and elsewhere and Afghanistan and occupy Muslim lands now... those who believe that "perhaps they would be helped" by that; by Allāh, they will not help them and will abandon them. If they abandoned disbelievers like them in Vietnam long ago, and abandoned their supporters among rulers and others, and dealt with them as if they are a disposable item used once. This is the law of the disbelievers, old and new. But there are those from our own skin and among these Muslims, unfortunately, who are the descendants of Abū Righāl. They are the ones being a help and supporter, allying with these people. They are the ones achieving this victory for the Americans and others. Despite that, they do not triumph in the true sense, because this is a temporary victory. Otherwise, if there were a victory, it would have been realized at least in this poor Afghanistan where they remained for more than ten years, tested all weapons they invented which the world had not seen, yet despite that they will leave in disgrace, and now they are wailing and fleeing.

Imagine just a court among them ruled yesterday in America for eighty-five million dollars for some soldiers due to exposure to chemicals

in Iraq or Afghanistan. Well, what about those who were struck by chemicals? So your blood is cheap, you have no value, you are not worth a dollar or even a hundred dollars. They used to buy the spy for fifty dollars and a hundred dollars to inform on the youth and the Mujahideen. These are criminals, eyes that must be gouged out. These who aid the disbelievers and spy on the Muslims and the monotheists.

Were it not for these eyes that spy and guide this plane and place this chip to kill and slaughter the innocent... these eyes must be gouged out and the Islamic world must be purified. If the Islamic world purified itself and returned to their Lord with Tawḥīd and sound Creed, and purified themselves from these harms and this filth and these so-called eyes that protect and watch over the interests of these criminal arrogant disbelievers on earth; by Allāh, victory would be realized and Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* ould give us victory and empower us on earth.

Therefore Ibn Kathīr continues and says: "'And they worship other than Allah that which does not benefit them or harm them' and the intent by that is idols." Worship does not mean worshipping idols in this simple naive form you know, but the intended meaning is **Obedience**. It means obedience in the Constitution. If the Constitution commands you with disobedience to Allāh and commands you with obedience to Satan, then this is the intended meaning "And they worship other than Allah that which does not benefit them or harm them." But it harms them as well; these people harm them in their creed, religion, and interests too. Backing, assisting, the important point here, means assisting Satan against his Lord *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* with enmity and Shirk. The criminal disbeliever assists Satan against his Lord with enmity and Shirk.

His saying, Exalted is He, in [Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah], I told you we say *Al-Mumtaḥinah* with kasrah and *Al-Mumtaḥanah* with fatḥah, this is permissible, in the second verse:

إِن يَثْقَفُوكُمْ يَكُونُوا لَكُمْ أَعْدَاءً وَيَبْسُطُوا إِلَيْكُمْ أَيْدِيَهُمْ وَأَلْسِنَتَهُم بِالسُّوءِ وَوَدُّوا لَوْ تَكْفُرُونَ

> "If they gain dominance over you, they would be to you as enemies and extend against you their hands and their tongues with evil, and they wish you would disbelieve." [QS. Al-Mumtaḥanah: 2]

Ibn Kathīr said: "'Meaning if they gained power over you, they would not fear [Allāh] regarding you in any harm they can inflict upon you by speech and action. 'And they wish you would disbelieve', meaning His saying, Exalted is He, in Sūrah Barā'ah: 'How [can there be a treaty] while,

if they gain dominance over you, they do not observe concerning you any pact of kinship or covenant of protection?' [QS. Al-Tawbah: 8]. It is the same. 'And they wish you would disbelieve' meaning they are eager that you do not attain any good. So their enmity to you is latent and apparent. So how can you ally with the likes of these? This is an agitation against their enmity as well."

Glory be to Allāh! He says to you: "We are children of Adam, we are all descendants of Abraham! We are all one company!" How are we all one company!!

This Abraham, peace be upon him, whom you argue by, says:

وَإِذْ قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ لِأَبِيهِ وَقَوْمِهِ إِنَّنِي بَرَاءٌ مِّمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ * إِلَّا الَّذِي فَطَرَنِي فَإِنَّهُ سَيَهْدِينِ

> "And [mention, O Muhammad], when Abraham said to his father and his people, 'Indeed, I am disassociated from that which you worship. Except for He who created me; and indeed, He will guide me.'" [QS. Al-Zukhruf: 26-27]

"There has already been for you an excellent pattern in Abraham and those with him, when they said to their people, 'Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from whatever you worship other than Allah. We have denied you, and there has appeared between us and you animosity and hatred forever until you believe in Allah alone' except for the saying of Abraham to his father, 'I will surely ask forgiveness for you, but I have not [power to do] for you anything against Allah.'" [QS. Al-Mumtaḥanah: 4]

So Abraham, the Pattern (*Qudwah*), you say "We are descendants of Abraham", disassociated from his father, disassociated from his people, and disassociated from all of those. This is the Pattern you emulate. Would that you emulated Abraham!

"And who turns away from the religion of Abraham except him who fools himself? And We had chosen him in this world, and indeed he, in the Hereafter, will be among the righteous. When his Lord said to him, 'Submit', he said 'I have submitted [in Islam] to the Lord of the worlds.'" [QS. Al-Baqarah: 130-131]. This is Abraham whom you argue by in the issue of *Wilāyah*.

And notice even in His saying, Exalted is He, in [Sūrah Al-Kahf Verse number 20] when the Exalted said:

إِنَّهُمْ إِن يَظْهَرُوا عَلَيْكُمْ يَرْجُمُوكُمْ أَوْ يُعِيدُوكُمْ فِي مِلَّتِهِمْ وَلَن تُفْلِحُوا إِذًا أَبَدًا

"Indeed, if they come to know of you, they will stone you or return you to their religion. And never would you succeed, then - ever." [QS. Al-Kahf: 20]

The point here in the issue of *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh*: "If they come to know of you" (gain dominance over you), overcome you; because if the disbeliever overcomes you, the result is "they will stone you", military courts, imprisoning you, "or return you to their religion"; they tempt you away from your religion, you disbelieve in your religion. You know "Retractions and Revisions" (*Tarāju'āt wa Murāja'āt*) regarding Faith. I am amazed at those who retracted. Retracted from what? Meaning did the current governments become, *mā shā' Allāh*, good? They retracted with the same government that tortured them in their religion?! With the same immoral, criminal government deviating from the Law of Allāh, which enslaved people to Taghut and Satan, and spread immorality and the legalization of usury and prohibitions, and enslaved people to laws for which Allāh sent down no authority? They retracted in it! Meaning you retracted upon what? Did the man become Muslim? Did they rule by Shari'ah so you could retract?!

Did the soldiers of this deposed Hosni become, for example, soldiers of Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, and become soldiers of Islam and protectors of Islam?!

And did State Security change after that, which used to violate sanctities, violate honors, and violate boys and children, and sodomy and lesbianism; everything you can imagine of crimes they committed and charges they fabricated?! Despite that, you allied with them, praised them, and backed them. Indeed, when Aḥmad Ra'fat, the Director of State Security Investigations, perished shortly before the revolution, they sang his praises! They recited poetry about him!

This one who destroyed their brothers, killed them, and violated their honors; and this one who used to torture them for their religion; yet despite that, they retracted! So you backed them, you supported them, you were a help to them. And even now after the revolution, Glory be to Allāh, they did not retract the retraction. Rather they said: "We were not coerced! And we did that of our own accord despite the prisons!" And people were seeking excuses for them. They still back and incite against the monotheists

in Egypt now, and against the steadfast among the people of Shari'ah and Creed.

These groups called "Retired Mujahid," and "Junk and Waste" among those who lagged behind the Creed and Shari'ah. Someone whose information stopped at the year 81 and was a Mujahid in meaning or by desire or by pension (retirement); they became "Mujahideen on Pension." They theorize now on satellite channels, inciting, backing, and allying with the enemies of Allāh against these youth, exploiting their weakness and exploiting the circumstances they are in.

So now people are drowning in this. The concept of *Muẓāharah* (Backing), the concept of *Munāṣarah* (Support), the concept of *Wudd* (Affection), the concept of *Maḥabbah* (Love) which is supposed to be directed to Allāh the Exalted, directed to His Messenger, and directed to His monotheist, humble, submissive slaves. All these meanings of proximity, affection, familiarity, support, and assistance were supposed to be directed to Allāh, His Messenger, and the believers. But now they are directed to other than Allāh, and they confuse people regarding their religion.

These are the Shar‘ī evidences. I tried to summarize as much as possible because there are more than fifty evidences among these evidences. However, I will suffice with this amount, and we will complete in the next lecture, which is the fifth lecture. We will try to be brief in Shar‘ī evidences so we can enter after that into the rest of the main topics we will talk with you about, *In shā’ Allāh*.

I say this statement of mine and ask Allāh for forgiveness for me and for you.

Al-salāmu ‘alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Fifth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allāh from the evils of our souls and the bad consequences of our deeds. Whomever Allāh guides, there is none to misguide him, and whomever He leaves astray, there is none to guide him. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Honored brothers everywhere, *Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh*.

This is the fifth lecture among the lectures on *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* (Loyalty and Disavowal) or *Al-Muwālāh* and *Al-Mu'ādāh* (Alliance and Enmity). *In shā' Allāh*, we will speak today, by the permission and help of Allāh, about an important issue, which is: The issue of a Muslim backing/aiding (*Muẓāharah*) a polytheist. This is the core of our subject. Our starting point will be refining the effective cause that necessitates takfīr (*Taḥrīr al-Manāṭ al-Mukaffir*) in the issue of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'* from the premise of our discussion of the Ḥadīth of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*. For the indication of this Ḥadīth might be the ambiguity for some, the indication of this Ḥadīth itself, and this is what caused confusion in some understandings through the indication of this Ḥadīth.

However, if we look at the evidences collectively, especially the decisive (*Muḥkam*) Holy Quran, we find that there are decisive verses that settled this dispute, and we will speak about this subject as well. We have spoken with you before regarding the Shar'ī evidences and we decided to summarize them in these lectures, *In shā' Allāh*, although some evidences we will cite later through our discussion of some specific issues and subjects we spoke about in the first lecture.

So, is what the Companion Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* did Kufr that expels from the Millah? Or did he commit a prohibited act (*Ḥarām*)? And if Ḥāṭib's action was apparent *Muwālāh* (alliance) with the polytheists, why did the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* not rule with his Kufr? And is it true that the *Manāṭ* (cause) for not declaring him a disbeliever was due to his internal *Muwālāh* (heartfelt alliance) with the Messenger and the believers? There are some questions: Why did Umar say: "Let me strike [the neck of] this hypocrite" if Ḥāṭib's action was merely Ḥarām? Meaning he committed a major sin only and not something expelling from the Millah. Despite that, when Umar spoke, the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu*

‘alayhi wa sallam did not rebuke him. We want to shed light on these issues.

The fact that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "He has told you the truth." What is the intent of his saying: "He has told you the truth"? And is Ḥāṭib's fear for his family in Mecca an excuse considered in Shari'ah (i.e., preventing his Takfīr)? And regarding the saying of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* to the Companions and to Umar specifically when he said to him: "And what would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr and said: Do whatever you wish"; does witnessing Badr prevent Major Kufr? And if Ḥāṭib had done a prohibited action, meaning committed a major sin, why did the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* not punish him?

This is what we will dwell upon today, *In shā’ Allāh*, from these subjects. However, before we enter the core of the subjects, we must present before you the text of the Ḥadīth of Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah, because this is the starting point from which we will launch today, by the permission of Allāh.

This Ḥadīth (the Ḥadīth of Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah) was narrated by Imām Al-Bukhārī in the Book of Tafsīr, and he also narrated it in the Book of Maghāzī (Military Expeditions) and in the Book of Jihad. You know Al-Bukhārī's method that he used to divide the Ḥadīth and distribute it over several chapters of the chapters of his book.

Al-Bukhārī said in the Ḥadīth, and we will take the text found in the Book of Maghāzī, and there is a similar text also in the Book of Tafsīr from *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī,* Al-Bukhārī cited with his chain from ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Rāfi‘ who said: "I heard ‘Alī *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* saying: The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* sent me, Al-Zubayr, and Al-Miqdād b. Al-Aswad, saying: 'Go forth until you reach Rawḍat Khākh, for there is a woman traveling on a camel (*Ẓa‘īnah*) and she has a letter, so take it from her.' So we set forth, our horses racing with us, until we reached the Rawḍah, and there we found the woman. We said: 'Bring out the letter.' She said: 'I have no letter.' We said: 'You will surely bring out the letter or we will surely cast off [your] clothes.'

So she brought it out from her braids (*‘iqāṣ*). We came with it to the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and behold, in it was: 'From Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah to some people of the polytheists from the people of Mecca,' informing them of some of the affair of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: 'O Ḥāṭib, what is this?' He said: 'O Messenger of Allāh, do not be hasty with me. I was a person attached (*mulṣaq*) to Quraysh

[as an ally], and I was not of their own selves. Those who are with you of the Muhājirīn have relatives in Mecca by whom they protect their families and wealth. So I loved, since I missed that lineage among them, to take a hand [favor] with them by which they would protect my relatives. And I did not do it out of Kufr, nor apostasy, nor being pleased with Kufr after Islam.' The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: 'He has indeed told you the truth.' Umar said: 'O Messenger of Allāh, let me strike the neck of this hypocrite.' He said: 'Indeed, he has witnessed Badr, and what would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr and said: Do whatever you wish, for I have forgiven you.'" The Ḥadīth ends in its entirety. Its parts are many and distributed with Imām Al-Bukhārī, and it is with Muslim also in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* but with different wordings. At the end of it, when he said: "He told the truth," he said "Say nothing but good to him." He said: "So Umar returned and said: O Messenger of Allāh, he has betrayed Allāh, His Messenger, and the believers. Let me strike his neck. He said: Is he not of the people of Badr? And what would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon them and said: Do whatever you wish, for I have obligated Paradise for you. His eyes filled with tears and he said: Allāh and His Messenger know best." This is also in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. It is distributed in several chapters, but this text which we took is in the Book of Seeking Repentance of Apostates.

So Umar in the other narration (Muslim's narration) clarified that he betrayed Allāh and His Messenger, while in the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī* he said: "Let me strike the neck of this hypocrite," but he said here that he betrayed Allāh, His Messenger, and the believers.

Thus, this is the Ḥadīth which is the pillar (*'Umdah*) for those who spoke on the issue of allying with enemies, or apparent alliance with enemies. They based some rulings on it; they spoke about apparent alliance for whoever participates with them, whoever allies with them, and whoever turns to them. Then they also based some other rulings regarding the spy and one who works for them, and some branches we will speak about later. But the point here which we will speak about is the reality of backing (*Muẓāharah*) the polytheists against the believers through this Ḥadīth.

However, I would like to clarify some notes:

- The biography of Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* is found in *Usd al-Ghābah*, mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr, and he mentioned it in his biography also in *Al-Iṣābah* by Ibn Ḥajar, and in books of Sīrah, because he died, *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*, during the Caliphate of 'Uthmān b. 'Affān in the year 30 AH, and his age at that time was 65 years.

- Also, the text of the message: Al-Bukhārī mentioned generally that he corresponded with people there informing them of the Prophet's coming. But the text of the message was also mentioned by Yaḥyā b. Sallām verbatim. He said: "To proceed, O gathering of Quraysh, indeed the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* has come to you with an army like the night, marching like the torrent. By Allāh, if he came to you alone, Allāh would give him victory and fulfill His promise to him. So look to yourselves. Peace." This speech was also quoted by Ibn Ḥajar in *Fatḥ al-Bārī* when he commented on this Ḥadīth.
- We will also speak regarding his saying, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*: "Do whatever you wish, for I have forgiven you," and in Muslim's narration: "For Paradise has become obligated for you." This is what we will dwell upon, *In shā' Allāh*, but let us start now.

We said the word *Muẓāharah* (Backing) means assistance (*I'ānah*), support (*Munāṣarah*), and endorsement (*Ta'yīd*), so that the backed party achieves appearance (*Ẓuhūr*), elevation, and dominance over the other party. So when you back the polytheists, you assist and help them towards the elevation of Kufr and rulings of Kufr, and the dominance of disbelievers over believers. Thus, this is what is meant by the word *Muẓāharah*. Therefore, in the verse:

وَإِن تَظَاهَرَ عَلَيْهِ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ مَوْلَاهُ وَجِبْرِيلُ وَصَالِحُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

"But if you cooperate (*taẓāharā*) against him - then indeed Allah is his protector, and Gabriel and the righteous of the believers." [QS. Al-Taḥrīm: 4]

So *taẓāharā* against him means cooperated against him, assistance against him.

So the action which Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* did via this letter, and the Messenger commanded regarding the Conquest of Mecca, because this letter was during the Conquest of Mecca, he was raiding, resolving to invade Mecca, and he had blinded the news, but Ḥāṭib did this action and sent this letter with this woman who was caught red-handed and was hiding the letter in her braids, meaning the braid of her hair. So this letter revealed that it was a message to Quraysh to inform them of the Messenger's invasion and that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* was, as we told you, like a torrent.

What we understand here is that this is **Apparent *Muwālāh***. Some said here: Was this *Muwālāh* Kufr? Because the verse in Sūrah Al-

Mumtaḥanah was revealed regarding Ḥāṭib, which is the first verse: "O you who have believed, do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies." So this which Ḥāṭib did is apparent *Muwālāh*. But they differed: Is this *Muwālāh* of Ḥāṭib Kufr? Or is it, as some said, prohibited (*Ḥarām*) only? With the evidence that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* did not declare him a disbeliever and said: "He told you the truth."

I give you the opinions, then we will discuss after that the issue of the **Effective Cause of Takfīr (*Manāṭ al-Takfīr*)** in the issue. The *Manāṭ* simply means that upon which a thing is suspended/hung. *Naṭṭu al-ḥabl bi al-watad* means I suspended the rope on the peg. And in the Ḥadīth: "A tree having *anwāṭ*" (hangings), meaning a tree upon which they used to hang their weapons. According to the Uṣūlīs (scholars of principles), as Al-Shanqīṭī said: "The *Manāṭ* is the reason (*'Illah*) to which the ruling is tied (*nīṭa*), meaning suspended"; i.e., it is that upon which the ruling is suspended.

This is an issue you listen to with Dr. Ṭāriq in some Uṣūlī issues, and issues of Verifying the Manāṭ (*Taḥqīq al-Manāṭ*), Examination and Division (*Al-Sabr wa al-Taqsīm*), and Refining the Manāṭ (*Taḥrīr al-Manāṭ*). These issues in detail you find, and the best who explained this is Sheikh Al-Shanqīṭī in his *Mudhakkarah* (Memorandum). And in *Aḍwā' al-Bayān*, frankly, he is among the best contemporary Uṣūlīs who explained this. Before him, the scholars also, and they are many. Among contemporaries also is Dr. Muṣṭafā Shalabī who used to teach us Uṣūl al-Fiqh in Egypt, and also Dr. 'Abd al-Majīd, and many contemporaries. But the best you can read for on this issue among contemporaries is Sheikh Al-Shanqīṭī *raḥimahullāh*.

We return again: Some of these people, when they took this form which he did (Ḥāṭib's alliance with Quraysh), they based other things upon it; they said then there are other actions, they analogized them to Ḥāṭib's action, they said this means guiding to the nakedness (*'awrah*) of Muslims is not Kufr, supporting the disbelievers, and warning them of Muslims when they want to attack them and preparing equipment for them; so this is not considered Kufr, they said this and based it on Ḥāṭib's action. They said these are prohibited actions only. That a Muslim presents to disbelievers what leads to infliction of harm (*Nikāyah*) even upon Muslims, they considered that, to the degree of inflicting harm on Muslims, they say this is also not Kufr. Look how they arranged this due to confusion in this issue.

So this is what they relied upon in this subject. They said: Ḥāṭib's action was a severe, heinous, and major action. There is nothing stronger

than that Ḥāṭib divulged the secret of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and informed Quraysh. Thus, the one who guides to the nakedness of Muslims, spies on them, and participates even with them in fighting along with the armies of disbelievers, this is not Kufr. Why? Because he lacked another condition which is **Heartfelt Alliance (*Muwālāh Qalbiyyah*)**. They considered Apparent *Muwālāh* in itself not to be Kufr; for it to be Kufr, it must be accompanied by Heartfelt *Muwālāh*, meaning he declares and says to them: "I love the disbelievers, and I do that out of pleasure with the disbelievers," declaring what is in his heart.

They said Ḥāṭib said: "By Allāh, I did not apostatize, O Messenger of Allāh, nor out of pleasure [with Kufr]." They said this means his loyalty was to the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and he did a Kufr action which is Apparent *Muwālāh*, meaning those who view that [as Kufr]. So this means he did not disbelieve because the other condition, which they considered the *Manāṭ* of Takfīr, is Heartfelt *Muwālāh*. So both must be together. Thus, if someone allies with disbelievers apparently, he says: No, we do not judge him with merely *Muwālāh* as Kufr in itself, but we must verify that he allies with his heart.

You say to him: How do we verify that? He says: He must declare it, otherwise we do not know him. Okay, if a man wanted to demolish the Kaaba, and the American army said, as they do now, "We will come with the army and take from the descendants of Abū Righāl, and they testify that there is no god but Allāh and Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh, and their names are Muḥammad and Maḥmūd and these." They will come to the Kaaba and demolish it, invade the Kaaba, destroy it, and annihilate it. So this *Muwālāh*, he came in their rank to fight and demolish the Kaaba, this is Apparent *Muwālāh*. He says to you: Yes, but he does not disbelieve! Why? Because he declares that he loves Allāh and His Messenger, and that he loves Islam, and that he is Muslim. So as long as he says he loves Allāh and His Messenger and is Muslim, then even if he participated in demolishing the Kaaba, and even if he participated in demolishing the Prophet's Mosque or Al-Aqsa Mosque with the Jews and Christians and with the disbelievers, and he is the one who guided them, went with them, and fought with them, he says: No, as long as he says "I love Allāh and His Messenger," then he did not commit Kufr. That is because they stipulated a condition, which is: Heartfelt (Internal) Alliance. So it is required that you view his declaration that he went with them apparently to demolish the Kaaba while being pleased with that. He says: "I am pleased with demolishing the Kaaba, I hate Islam and Muslims."

Meaning, according to them, whoever sees any human doing actions like this Apparent *Muwālāh,* they say: As long as he did not declare

what is in his heart, then he is still a believer; he committed a major sin, committed something prohibited, and that's it. Meaning demolishing the Kaaba and the three mosques, violating honors, and legalizing prohibitions, as long as he did not declare with his heart!

So they said: That Ḥāṭib fell into backing the polytheists against the believers, but what prevented his Takfīr is that he was allying with the believers (Internal Alliance). Meaning they placed a restriction on Apparent *Muwālāh* which is not found even in the Holy Quran, even in Sūrah Al-Mā'idah for example in the evidence we spoke about, it does not exist.

Some said: And what prevented the Messenger from declaring him a disbeliever? They said: Because he declared that he did not apostatize, and what he did was not out of Kufr, and he did not apostatize after Faith, and the justification and reasoning mentioned by our Master Ḥāṭib.

Therefore the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said when Umar said: "Let me strike this hypocrite," he said: "What would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr..." Okay, does that mean that the people of Badr, if they committed Major Kufr, this prevents the infliction of punishment upon them or passing the ruling of Kufr on them? Is witnessing Badr in itself immunity for them from falling into Shirk? Naturally, by the testimony of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, they are in Paradise, so they did not do that and Allāh protected them from that. But they commit sins or some major sins then seek forgiveness and repent and so on. But the issue of Kufr is not permitted, even for Prophets: "If you should associate [anything] with Allah, your work would surely become worthless" [QS. Al-Zumar: 65]. This is said to the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and said to Prophets as well. So the subject that he witnessed Badr being the preventer (*Māni'*) is a type of faint inference, and this is contrary fundamentally to the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*. Otherwise, the Messenger punished some Badr participants, like Misṭaḥ b. Uthāthah; he punished him and flogged him as a *Ḥadd* (prescribed punishment), and witnessing Badr did not prevent him from establishing the *Ḥadd* on him.

Naturally, the other party said: No, Ḥāṭib's action was prohibited *Muwālāh*; that he informed Quraysh and that's it, because he loved the Messenger and lived with the Messenger. Therefore, it is merely prohibited *Muwālāh* and that's it. Well, Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* says: "O you who have believed, do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies." There is not in the Book of Allāh among the evidences, which we mentioned to you

and which we did not mention to you, there is not in it this type of *Muwālāh*, nor these restrictions, nor conditions for which Allāh has sent down no authority. Allāh *'Azza wa Jalla* arranged Major Kufr upon mere *Muwālāh* of polytheists, and the matter ended.

Even some of these say: That Ḥāṭib in the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and in the *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad, when he said: "For I knew that Allāh will make His Messenger appear (victorious) and complete his affair for him, but I was a stranger (*'azīz* - rare/lacking support) among them and my mother was with them, so I wanted to take this [favor] with them." This is in the *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad, and Sheikh Al-Albānī authenticated this Ḥadīth, and Sheikh Muqbil and others classified it as *Ḥasan*. And in another narration also he says: "And I knew that that would not harm you." Notice Ḥāṭib is now justifying why he did this.

Regarding the opinion of the scholars who viewed that Ḥāṭib's backing was Polytheistic *Muẓāharah* and Kufr and not a prohibited action in the sense that it is a major sin not expelling from the Millah... Some scholars inferred the opposite of what those inferred who said Ḥāṭib's action was backing polytheists but what prevented [Takfīr] was that his heart was tranquil with Faith, and that his heart did not hate the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, so he did not declare his hatred for the believers nor his hatred for the Messenger, thus he was a believer on this basis.

However, the scholars who said the opposite of this, among the evidences they inferred with is that **Umar himself ruled Ḥāṭib with Kufr and Hypocrisy**. He said: "He betrayed Allāh, His Messenger, and the believers." Why? Because Umar saw this action as backing the polytheists and supporting them. So this was established in the mind of Umar and the Companions that this is Kufr, and this is Shirk, and this is aiding against Muslims. This is what Imām Al-Bayhaqī declared in his *Sunan* when he said: "And he —meaning the Messenger, peace be upon him— did not denounce Umar for naming him as such." When he said to him he is a hypocrite and let me strike his neck and that he betrayed Allāh and His Messenger, when Umar said that in front of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, he did not say to him "Do not say that" and "Do not call him a hypocrite." No, the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* did not say that to him. Instead, he mentioned something else to him: that he witnessed Badr and perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr and said "I have forgiven you."

So Umar inferred from this apparent action (Ḥāṭib's letter to the disbelievers of Quraysh) that what he did was an **apparent sign of hypocrisy**. And one only disbelieves if he declares a Muslim a disbeliever

without interpretation (*Ta'wīl*). Meaning he declared a Muslim a disbeliever now, so he said: "Let me strike the neck of this hypocrite." And the Messenger prevented declaring a Muslim a disbeliever; meaning a Muslim does not say to a Muslim "O Disbeliever," "then it returns upon one of them." That is because he declared him a disbeliever **with interpretation**. Otherwise, the Messenger would have said to him "You have disbelieved by that, O Umar" because he applied Kufr to a specific individual, Ḥāṭib. This is the summary of Imām Al-Bayhaqī's speech.

There is also speech that the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* did not reply to Umar's statement but remained silent. And the meaning that he remained silent is that he approved, and the Messenger does not remain silent on falsehood. So that was an approval that the ruling of *Muẓāharah* (backing) is Kufr and Shirk. But the Messenger after that inquired and sought details from Ḥāṭib and asked him: "What is this, O Ḥāṭib? What did you do?" He wanted to clarify the matter, because he was going to apply a ruling on a specific individual now. So the action he did, this is Kufr, but he is now seeking details from Ḥāṭib regarding the **motive** that made him undertake that. Because he will apply the ruling on the specific individual.

When the matter became clear, he faulted Umar. Meaning Umar erred in what? He did not err in judging the action; he erred in applying the ruling to Ḥāṭib specifically. Therefore scholars differentiate between one who erred in describing an action as Kufr, and one who erred in applying the description to a specific individual. Here the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* clarified the matter to him, that Ḥāṭib defended himself and said: "By Allāh, I did not do it out of Kufr." And Ḥāṭib, as in the text before us, said to him: "Do not be hasty with me, I was a person attached..." then he said: "And I did not do it out of Kufr, nor apostasy, nor being pleased with Kufr after Islam."

The point here is that **what Ḥāṭib did is Kufr**, with the evidence that Ḥāṭib said: "I did not do it out of Kufr, do not be hasty with me, O Messenger of Allāh, and I did not apostatize after Faith."

Well, by Allāh upon you, if the issue was that Ḥāṭib did a normal prohibited action, meaning a major sin or any of the major sins for which a human seeks forgiveness and so on, would he have said "I did not disbelieve"? No one says it regarding what he knows is not Kufr expelling from the Millah.

So when he said "I did not do it out of Kufr nor pleasure nor apostasy after Islam," then Ḥāṭib knows that this action is Kufr. Otherwise, why apologize saying "I did not do this out of Kufr"? Because this is what is in his mind, that his action is **Kufr Alliance**. Therefore he said to the

Messenger of Allāh: "I did not do it out of Kufr." If the issue was not Kufr, it would have been possible for him to say: "I seek forgiveness from Allāh, O Messenger of Allāh, by Allāh I erred," as happens to any human who commits a sin or something prohibited, he would say that. But to say "I, by Allāh, did not disbelieve, nor apostatize"; why say all these words? Thus, Ḥāṭib knows that this action is Kufr, that *Muwālāh* here is apparently Kufr, and not a prohibited action as some scholars say.

So Ḥāṭib acquitting himself with this and pushing Kufr away from himself is evidence that this action is Kufr. Well, what prevented the application of Kufr upon Ḥāṭib? Meaning some say the Exalted said: "Indeed, Allah does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills" [QS. Al-Nisā': 48]. And when Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* said to the people of Badr "Do whatever you wish," does it mean they can disbelieve and nothing is upon them?

This verse applies to the dead; meaning if someone died, Allāh does not forgive him as long as he did not repent from Shirk. But if one was alive and disbelieved or associated partners or was an atheist or did anything or apostatized then repented, Allāh forgives him and accepts his repentance. But if he died: "Indeed, Allah does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills."

Well, those who say he committed Kufr. Well, did we say that Ḥāṭib disbelieved? We did not say Ḥāṭib disbelieved, and refuge is sought with Allāh. He did a **Kufr action**. *Muwālāh* is an action which is Kufr; its description in Shari'ah is that it is Kufr, according even to Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah whose verses were revealed because of him, that it is Kufr. But he did not disbelieve so that we say, even those who infer with this verse: "Indeed, Allah does not forgive association with Him...", did we say he associated partners or became a polytheist? Ḥāṭib did not disbelieve, and we did not judge him with Kufr. Why?

This is what we will speak about. What is the *Manāṭ* (cause) that made us say Ḥāṭib did not disbelieve? Why did the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* rule with his non-disbelief? Did he rule for him due to Heartfelt *Muwālāh*, meaning his arguing and excuse with his heart? Did he rule for him due to his fear for his family and children? Is this an excuse? The excuse of money and fear and so on? This is what we will speak about.

We clarify the issue simply as well: Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* fell into Kufr action, but what prevented the application of the ruling of Takfīr upon him is a **Preventer (*Māni‘*) from the Preventers of Takfīr**.

Among the preventers of Takfīr: Ruling with Kufr on a specific person has a special chapter different from Absolute Takfīr, or ruling on actions. Pay close attention to this. For Takfīr of a specific individual, conditions must be met and preventers must be absent. "Specific" means the person, someone named Zayd, someone named Maḥmūd, now the Companion Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*. What prevented his Takfīr is that conditions must be met and preventers absent; this is the description of this case.

There is a preventer they did not speak about unfortunately, even among contemporaries, because what made them fall into this is that they divided *Muwālāh* into several sections; *Muwālāh* that causes Kufr, and *Muwālāh* that does not cause Kufr. And confusion occurred in these matters, and we will speak about them later, *In shā' Allāh*. Because they gathered many forms under the chapter of *Muwālāh*, so they saw there are things: "How can this be Kufr? I deal with him in trade in valid things and in things in agriculture with disbelievers. How do you tell me if I work for him this is *Muwālāh* and I disbelieve by it?!" So they said: "We divide it into two parts." Although the origin of *Muwālāh* in the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh is one type; which is Support, Assistance, Proximity, and Nearness, which we defined for you.

Meaning *Al-Tawallī* which the scholars of the Najdi Call divided, when they placed many forms under the item of *Al-Walā'*, they were compelled to say *Al-Tawallī* is different from *Muwālāh*, even though the meaning is one; it is Proximity and Nearness, and that you ally with them for their dominance and the dominance of their Shari'ah and their authority over Faith and the people of Faith. This subject requires no riddles, logarithms, or talismans.

Naturally, they said he fundamentally did not commit Kufr, he committed a prohibited act only. And I refer the brothers to study "Issues of Faith" (*Masā'il al-Īmān*) regarding the division of sects and things we told you. I hope the brothers review them. Because by the definition of those who stipulate that this **Heartfelt Manāṭ** (Verification of the Heart) is an independent *Manāṭ*... meaning if the heart is not verifying, then in this case whatever you do, the important thing is the heart. So this is an independent condition, and a *Manāṭ* alone independently.

Therefore they said his action is prohibited, because the man did not declare that he hates the believers; on the contrary, he said he loves the Muslims. So even if he went to demolish the Kaaba or trampled the Muṣḥaf with feet or puts it in the toilet or urinates on it, he says: "This action's form is Kufr but we cannot judge him with Kufr, because the man might be a

believer! Why? Because we did not view his heart! And he might love Allāh and His Messenger! And Glory be to Allāh, he does such an action!"

Naturally, we will divide the Murji'ah for you, and the Murji'ah of the Jurists (*Murji'at al-Fuqahā'*), then even the Jahmiyyah with their first and second opinion on the issue of the sign of Faith... with the Murji'ah of the Jurists, all of them without exaggeration, except the Extremist Murji'ah, described this action as an action of Kufr. But because they stipulate the Sign (*'Alāmah*) and the Implication (*Lāzim*), they said: "And this is proof and a sign that his heart does not love Allāh and His Messenger." This is contrary to Ahl al-Sunnah. Ahl al-Sunnah said: The action is Kufr in itself, and it is not stipulated to view the heart; he is a disbeliever outwardly and inwardly.

So the specific individual requires conditions. Among the **Preventers of Takfīr is the Preventer of Interpretation (*Ta'wīl*)**. Meaning he interprets the thing. This is what Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* fell into. He was interpreting (*Muta'awwil*); interpreting that Allāh gives victory to His religion and manifests this victory, and that the disbelievers will not be able to defeat the army of the Messenger of Allāh. And he says: "I do that with them and it will not harm me at all, the Messenger is victorious over them."

And Ḥāṭib also was not in the army of disbelievers for example. Ḥāṭib migrated and defended the Messenger of Allāh and waged Jihad with the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*. We are speaking about the eighth Hijri year. And Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* had left his family and wealth as Ibn al-Qayyim said, for he spoke about him in *Zād al-Ma'ād*. So Ḥāṭib did things all of which were *Muwālāh* and support for the Messenger of Allāh.

As for people now in our era justifying... an employee, meaning committing an organized continuous crime allying with disbelievers every day, taking a salary, living with them, indeed some of them are soldiers for these polytheists or disbelievers or apostates, taking a salary for this. How do you apply this to this Companion?! Despite that, we said Ḥāṭib's action is a **Kufr Action**, but he did not disbelieve due to the **Preventer of Interpretation**, because he interpreted incorrectly; so that is not a justification for us to ally with them. He was saying: "There is no harm in what I did."

So when it predominates on someone's thought that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* will be victorious inevitably... while one [today] predominates on his thought that the disbelievers will destroy the Muslims, yet despite that he cooperates with them, and despite that allies

with them, and despite that fights with them too! How can you tell me this one was interpreting, fearing for himself, his wealth, and his children, and therefore committed these acts of Kufr and allied with them?!

If Ḥāṭib had predominated on his thought that the Messenger would be victorious, and he believed in the revelation of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, then what do these people believe?!

The speech is not from me; this speech was mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar *raḥimahullāh* in *Fatḥ al-Bārī* when he mentioned Ḥāṭib's justification and why he did not disbelieve. He said: "Because he did that interpreting (*muta'awwilan*) that there is no harm in it." Thus, the Preventer of Interpretation is a preventer considered by scholars. Otherwise, most scholars would have declared many scholars disbelievers who come up with strange and amazing things. What prevented the Takfīr of these scholars even in great issues of religion prevented them was the Preventer of Interpretation.

So the Preventer of Interpretation is considered in Shari'ah. Therefore the Messenger accepted that from him. Therefore Abū Al-'Abbās Al-Qurṭubī, the author of *Al-Mufhim*, different from Al-Qurṭubī the author of *Jāmi' al-Tafsīr*, Imām Al-Qurṭubī Abū Al-'Abbās said: "But Ḥāṭib did not hold hypocrisy in his heart nor apostatize from his religion. Rather he interpreted in what he did of that, that Quraysh's knowledge of some of the affair of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* would not harm the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and would frighten Quraysh, because he told them 'He came to you with an army like a torrent', and frighten them by that so they leave Mecca and flee from it. And the interpretation was beautified for him because his thought clung to his family and son, since they are a piece of his liver. And eloquent indeed is he who said: Rarely does he succeed who has dependents." Meaning Al-Qurṭubī says always the one who has dependents, they are obstacles in front of him in his path even if he is a Mujahid. "But Allāh was kind to him and saved him because He knew of the correctness of his faith and his truthfulness, and forgave him by the precedence of Badr and his priority." So he did not disbelieve due to the Preventer of Interpretation, but his action is Kufr. So the action of *Muwālāh* he did is Kufr and not a prohibited action as most contemporaries say! And I do not want to mention names because they are all known. Everything called this "Moderate Methodology" and all these since the days of Dr. Wahbah Al-Zuḥaylī, and this whole school, the school of Sheikh Al-Qaraḍāwī and Al-'Awwā and others, and some Salafist schools in all their contemporary ways approximately all view this; they view that his action was not causing Kufr and that his action was prohibited.

Because they stipulated a condition, for which Allāh sent down no book nor was it mentioned in the Holy Quran, which is the Independent Condition: the condition of **Heartfelt Alliance**. They considered it an independent condition, meaning it does not suffice to be Apparent *Muwālāh* only, Heartfelt Alliance must agree with it. If Heartfelt Alliance does not agree with it, then no. Well, how will we verify Heartfelt Alliance? He says to you: "He declares that he hates the believers and declares that he loves the disbelievers and that he does that with them." If you brought Iblis himself, he would not declare [it]! Unfortunately, this is the contemporary [view]; they do not consider *Muwālāh* itself in this Apparent aspect a Kufr action. They say: "We consider it Kufr if it agrees with the other condition which is Heartfelt Alliance."

Therefore Ibn Al-Jawzī in *Zād al-Masīr*, quoting from Judge Abū Ya‘lā, said: "And it is evidence that fear for wealth and child does not permit *Taqiyyah* in showing Kufr as fear for life permits. What clarifies this is that Allāh the Exalted obligated Hijrah (migration) and did not excuse them in lagging behind for the sake of their wealth and children. Ḥāṭib only thought that this was permissible for him to defend his child by it, just as it is permissible for him to defend himself by the like of it during *Taqiyyah*. Umar only said: 'Let me strike the neck of this hypocrite' because he thought that he did that without interpretation." Look at the speech of the scholars.

Ibn Al-Jawzī also says commenting on the Ḥadīth of Ḥāṭib: "So he sought closeness to the people —meaning to Quraysh— so they would protect him regarding his family, by informing them of some secrets of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* in plotting against them and intending to fight them. And he knew that that would not harm the Messenger of Allāh due to Allāh *‘Azza wa Jalla* giving him victory. This which he did bears interpretation (*Ta’wīl*). Therefore the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* used good opinion (*Ḥusn al-Ẓann*), and said in some wordings 'He has indeed told you the truth.' This Ḥadīth indicates that the ruling of the Interpreter (*Muta’awwil*) in declaring the prohibited permissible is contrary to the ruling of the Intender (*Muta‘ammid*) regarding its legalization without interpretation. It indicated that whoever commits a prohibited act or claims in that what bears interpretation, the statement is his statement, even if the predominant thought is contrary to it."

As in the Ḥadīth of Qudāmah b. Maẓ‘ūn; for they interpreted in the days of our Master Umar, and drank alcohol. So our Master Umar sent to them and said: "Ask them if they legalized it." If they believe alcohol is Ḥalāl, then strike their necks and the matter ends. And if they say it is

Ḥarām, he said: "Flog them the *Ḥadd*." And this is what happened, for they were interpreting that there is no blame upon them in that, and we will come to this example later.

The intended meaning is that the *Muwālāh* that causes Takfīr can be by way of speech or apparent action, and it is not imagined that it be restricted to the belief of the heart. This is the calamity. Most contemporaries and those who spoke on this issue restricted the Action that causes Takfīr and this *Muwālāh* that causes Takfīr to the belief of the heart. Even if they carried the image of *Muwālāh* causing Takfīr, they say: "It is Kufr outwardly but he did not ally heartily," and they stipulate Heartfelt Alliance. Others say that this is a prohibited action fundamentally, meaning *Muwālāh* in itself is fundamentally prohibited, meaning as if he committed a major sin among major sins. Because almost all of these stipulated Independence; the Independent *Manāṭ* according to them is Heartfelt Belief.

So the cause of this problem, as I told you, is that they inserted into the word *Muwālāh*, from the perspective of Shar'ī terminology... they inserted into the name *Muwālāh* things that cause Takfīr and things that do not cause Takfīr, and divided it into this division because some scholars put all forms into one "basket."

We said Apparent *Muwālāh* in itself is Kufr. Notice that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* did not consider fear for wealth nor other things. And we read to you the speech of Imām Sulaymān b. 'Abd Allāh (the grandson) in the Tafsīr of the verse of Sūrah [Al-Mā'idah from Verse 51 to Verse 52]. This verse is a governing verse in the issue. The Exalted said: "O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people. So you see those in whose hearts is disease hastening into [association with] them, saying, 'We are afraid a misfortune may strike us.' But perhaps Allah will bring conquest or a decision from Him, and they will become, over what they have been concealing within themselves, regretful."

Notice the text here is that Allāh decreed the Kufr of whoever allies with disbelievers: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them." So Support (*Nuṣrah*) is *Muwālāh* in itself, and it is the most apparent meaning of *Muwālāh*; it is in the Book of Allāh.

Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* says in another verse in [Sūrah Al-Shūrā]: "And they will not have any allies to aid them other than Allah" [QS. Al-Shūrā: 46]. The gist of this: Whoever supports the disbelievers,

then he is of them, meaning a disbeliever. Well, where is the condition? They said Kufr here is that he supports them but it is coupled with his love and pleasure with their Kufr. We say to them: Where is this condition in the Book of Allāh? Where is this condition in the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*? This condition does not exist fundamentally. Rather Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* said the opposite of what they say, for their justification was: "We are afraid a misfortune may strike us." So mere fear and dread, and these are actions of hearts, and these actions do not enter into the name of Faith; they have no relation to the name of Faith neither linguistically nor terminologically, Allāh *‘Azza wa Jalla* did not consider this speech they said and said: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them."

So who restricted this so they say that for one who allies with disbelievers with Apparent *Muwālāh*, there must be love for them in his heart and pleasure with their actions? Who told you this condition?! And how do we verify this condition fundamentally? And the verse speaks "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them," and the matter ends.

Scholars argued with these evidences for the Kufr of whoever supported disbelievers, any human who supported disbelievers. Al-Qurṭubī (author of *Al-Jāmi‘*) said: "'And whoever is an ally to them among you' meaning backs them against the Muslims, 'then indeed, he is [one] of them.' The Exalted clarified that his ruling is like their ruling." He did not stipulate heart nor otherwise, and these things are not in the verse.

And Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥimahullāh* sometimes they take his words and strike some against others. Ibn Taymiyyah said in *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā*: "'And whoever is an ally to them among you' so he agrees with them and assists them, then he is of them."

And Sheikh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb in *Nawāqiḍ al-Islām* argued with this verse, the verse of Sūrah Al-Mā’idah, and considered it a nullifier among the nullifiers of Islam.

Someone says: Well, what is the evidence that Apparent *Muwālāh* is causing Takfīr in itself? The Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* applied this to his uncle and ruled him with Kufr in the Battle of Badr when he was captured for supporting the disbelievers, because he came with the army of Quraysh at that time. Al-‘Abbās argued that he was a Muslim concealing his faith and went out with them coerced. The Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* did not say to him: "O ‘Abbās, did you go out with these polytheists out of love for them? Did your heart love them? Was your heart hating us?! Are you pleased with their religion?" He did not say

anything on this subject. Although he said: "I, O Messenger of Allāh, became Muslim while I was there, and I went out coerced," so he would pardon him and not pass the ruling of disbelievers on him. That was not established, and the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* did not say anything to him. On the contrary, he took the ransom from him and he paid his ransom and the ransom of 'Aqīl and so on.

And the Messenger treated them as disbelievers. He said to him: "We take you by your apparent [action]," because he allied with the disbelievers and came with them in their army. So he said to him: "As for your Islam, Allāh is aware of you," meaning we leave you to Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*.

The point in the story of our Master Al-'Abbās is that the Messenger treated him even though he claimed Islam and claimed coercion, and he did not accept it from him since his apparent state was contrary to that; his apparent state was that he was with the disbelievers. But when captured he says these words. Because either he will be killed like the disbelievers or ransomed later. So this evidence is a witness that this Apparent *Muwālāh* in itself is Kufr, and Heartfelt Pleasure is not stipulated in it, nor is there another *Manāṭ* other than this *Manāṭ*, meaning the *Manāṭ* of Apparent *Muwālāh* in itself. So this condition is corrupt.

Because they always mouth off about this condition. They say: (No Takfīr by Apparent *Muwālāh* unless coupled with Heartfelt *Muwālāh*).

You find this on Salafist satellite channels! And whenever Salafism is Irja'-ist, and some are Extremist Irja', they stipulate such conditions and mouth off about them and infer by the incident of Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* that there is no Takfīr by Apparent *Muwālāh* unless coupled with Heartfelt *Muwālāh*.

The saying that stipulates this is considered the saying of **Extremist Murji'ah**, and this is a false condition for which Allāh sent down no authority.

Ahl al-Sunnah say: Whoever says or does what is Kufr; disbelieves, outwardly and inwardly by his saying or his action. This is the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah he mentioned in *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* when he said: "Whoever says or does what is Kufr; disbelieves outwardly and inwardly by his saying or his action." As for sitting and asking him "Did your heart love or not love?!", all these are stipulations for which Allāh sent down no authority.

I fear I may have prolonged for you. The summary I want to be fixed in your minds is that what Ḥāṭib did of **Apparent *Muwālāh* is Kufr**,

his action is Kufr. This is **Absolute Takfīr**, applied to an abstract cause. But the excuse that prevented his Takfīr is **Interpretation (*Ta’wīl*)**. He erred in interpretation naturally, therefore Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* admonished him with the verse of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah, and we will speak about it later, *In shā’ Allāh*. And that the Interpreter after that, the mistaken one, we do not call him a disbeliever. So Ḥāṭib did not disbelieve; he has a preventer among the preventers of Takfīr.

So, did Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* ally with the disbelievers and back them against the Muslims? Yes. Was the verse of Al-Mumtaḥanah "O you who have believed, do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies" revealed regarding him? Yes. Indeed, allying with disbelievers is Kufr without stipulating that it be coupled with Heartfelt *Muwālāh* as some claim, because Allāh says: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them" even though they said: "We are afraid a misfortune may strike us."

Secondly: That Ḥāṭib committed Kufr and not a sin as some claim, but Ḥāṭib did not disbelieve due to the existence of a preventer of Takfīr in his right, which is Interpretation, even if he erred in it. The preventer is **not witnessing Badr**, because some people think that. No, the preventer is Interpretation.

And that the preventer of his Takfīr, and we will speak about it later, did not prevent his deserving punishment as *Ta‘zīr* (discretionary punishment). Meaning he could have been punished as *Ta‘zīr* later. But after that, we will say what is the justification and why the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* did not punish him if the saying is as you say.

So there is a preventer of his Takfīr which is Interpretation even if he erred in it, as happened with the Companion Qudāmah b. Maẓ‘ūn who drank alcohol, but drank it interpreting the verse of Al-Mā’idah, and we will speak about it later, *In shā’ Allāh*. And there is also a preventer of his *Ta‘zīr* which is witnessing Badr. Meaning the preventer of *Ta‘zīr* is witnessing Badr, but how did that happen?

This is what I will try to answer in the next lecture, because there are some branches and other issues *In shā’ Allāh*.

May Allāh bless you, and I suffice with this amount.

I say this statement of mine and ask Allāh for forgiveness for me and for you, and may Allāh bless you.

Al-salāmu ‘alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Sixth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allāh from the evils of our souls and the bad consequences of our deeds. Whomever Allāh guides, there is none to misguide him, and whomever He leaves astray, there is none to guide him. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Honored brothers everywhere, *Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh*.

Here we are with the sixth lecture among the lectures on *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. Today, *In shā' Allāh*, we will complete the subject of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*. I would like to remind you that there are some doubts (*Shubuhāt*) I mentioned, but I want today to detail these issues derived from the Ḥadīth of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah.

First: I will mention to you eight issues we will speak about quickly today; they are: Is the saying of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* as in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* regarding the people of Badr: "What would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr and said: Do whatever you wish, for Paradise has become obligated for you"; is this the Preventer (*Māni'*) of Ḥāṭib's Kufr? Because some say: This is the Preventer because the Messenger said that. And many people, unfortunately, believe that his witnessing of Badr is the Preventer of describing his action as Kufr.

Second: The justification of some for the non-Kufr of Ḥāṭib's action by his saying *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*: "He has indeed told you the truth." Does this phrase imply that the Preventer of Ḥāṭib's Kufr is that he did that as Apparent *Muwālāh* for a worldly purpose? And as long as Heartfelt *Muwālāh* was absent with a worldly purpose, then this is not Kufr. Thus, anyone who allies with disbelievers with Apparent *Muwālāh* for a worldly purpose, with the absence of his Heartfelt *Muwālāh* for the disbelievers, then this means he is not a disbeliever. And this is the justification for the non-Kufr of Ḥāṭib, for example. This is what those say who justify the absence of Absolute Kufr for Ḥāṭib in this action of his. Notice, we say Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* did not disbelieve. We are speaking about the action he did: Is it Kufr or not? We say: Yes, it is Kufr. The action he did (this *Muwālāh*) is Kufr, but what is the Preventer from applying Kufr to him as a specific person?

Third: They justified and said that Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* at the beginning of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah said: "O you who have believed," so He addressed him with Faith (*Īmān*). So this means he is not a disbeliever; Allāh did not judge his *Muwālāh* as Kufr. Meaning they evidence that Apparent *Muwālāh* of disbelievers and polytheists without Heartfelt *Muwālāh* is not Kufr. Because they say there must be a conjunction between the two: Apparent *Muwālāh* with Heartfelt *Muwālāh*. So they said: As long as Heartfelt *Muwālāh* for disbelievers is absent, or if he did a Kufr action, even if he fought with the disbelievers, he says as long as his heart is sound and tranquil and not allying, then this Apparent *Muwālāh* is disobedience only!

Fourth: Some say: What is the Preventer considered in Shari'ah in this case? We say the Preventer considered in Shari'ah in this case is **Interpretation (*Ta’wīl*)**; that he erred in Interpretation. Therefore the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* did not declare him a disbeliever because he interpreted (*ta’awwala*). But there are some doubts in the story of Interpretation. Is this subject open wide? No, there are controls for Legitimate Interpretation considered in Shari'ah, Invalid Interpretation (*Bāṭil*), and Corrupt Interpretation (*Fāsid*). When we come to this issue (the issue of Interpretation), we will define the meaning of Interpretation for you.

The Considered Interpretation which is considered a preventer among the preventers of Takfīr is as in the story of the Companion, and also in the story of Qudāmah b. Maẓ‘ūn when he drank alcohol interpreting (*muta’awwilan*) and thought that as long as he does righteous deeds, nothing is upon him. Therefore Umar *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* sent for him and said: If he legalized it, strike his neck, meaning he became a disbeliever. But if he confessed and acknowledged its prohibition, flog him the *Ḥadd* for drinking alcohol. So he was interpreting, so they flogged him the *Ḥadd* for drinking alcohol.

Fifth: There are also subsidiary doubts. Meaning someone says: Well, if we acknowledged that Ḥāṭib was interpreting, why did the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* not ask him to repent and clarify his error to him? We will speak on this.

Sixth: If he committed this action, whether you call it an error or a major sin or anything, this action necessitates punishment. Why did the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* not punish him? And Umar later when he was Caliph *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* punished Qudāmah b. Maẓ‘ūn. This one witnessed Badr and that one witnessed Badr; this one interpreted and erred and that one interpreted and erred. Why did Umar punish Qudāmah

b. Maẓ'ūn and the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* did not punish the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah?

Seventh: I will speak with you also about the summary of the statement regarding the subject of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah, and the gist of the statement on the whole subject, and what is the Preventer of his Takfīr, and why the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* did not declare him a disbeliever?

Eighth: I want to clarify, because this is a very important rule in many rules of Takfīr, so we must refute it, which is: "**There is no Takfīr by Apparent *Muwālāh* unless coupled with Heartfelt *Muwālāh***." We will refute this doubt, *In shā' Allāh*, and clarify the corruption of this saying, and that it existed in the past as well and scholars refuted it.

We begin now with **First: Is the saying of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* to the people of Badr "Do whatever you wish" the Preventer of Ḥāṭib's Kufr because he witnessed Badr?**

Because the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* receives Revelation "Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination." So he says he witnessed Badr, so it means that this is the Preventer of his Takfīr. Those who said that, this is their argument to get rid of this issue; that this phrase indicates that he allied with them with Apparent *Muwālāh* and divulged the secret of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* regarding the arrival of the army to them in Mecca, and the Messenger said: "Do whatever you wish" and he did [it], so this is the Preventer of Ḥāṭib's Kufr.

This speech is refuted (*mardūd*), and this is speech of utmost error; because Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* said about His Prophets and the elite of His creation among Prophets and Messengers, for example in Sūrah Al-An'ām:

ذَٰلِكَ هُدَى اللَّهِ يَهْدِي بِهِ مَن يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ ۚ وَلَوْ أَشْرَكُوا لَحَبِطَ عَنْهُم مَّا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

> "That is the guidance of Allah by which He guides whom He wills of His servants. But if they had associated others with Allah, then worthless for them would be whatever they were doing." [QS. Al-An'ām: 88]

He speaks about the Prophets of Allāh, about the Messengers of Allāh: "But if they had associated others with Allah, then worthless for them would be whatever they were doing." All good deeds of the Prophets become worthless as if they never were. And Allāh says to His Prophet,

Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, the Seal of Prophets in Sūrah Al-Zumar:

وَلَقَدْ أُوحِيَ إِلَيْكَ وَإِلَى الَّذِينَ مِن قَبْلِكَ لَئِنْ أَشْرَكْتَ لَيَحْبَطَنَّ عَمَلُكَ وَلَتَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ

> "And it was already revealed to you and to those before you that if you should associate [anything] with Allah, your work would surely become worthless, and you would surely be among the losers." [QS. Al-Zumar: 65]

These are sent Prophets; if they associated partners, what they were doing would become worthless for them and they would be among the losers.

Are the people of Badr of this status (Status of Prophets)?! Meaning do the people of Badr commit Shirk and are forgiven? Meaning they are pardoned and forgiven if they commit Shirk? No rational person says this fundamentally; because this Shirk, if he commits it, he must repent in the world. But if he died, he will not be forgiven and it is over. As for in the world, he must repent. So Ḥāṭib is not permitted, nor anyone else, "Do whatever you wish." ("Do whatever you wish") scholars said has many interpretations: Do whatever you wish, either meaning "Do in the future," because of the righteous deeds and good deeds they did, if errors and sins occur from them, because they are not infallible from error, then Allāh has forgiven that for them because of these good deeds. And it has been proven that these [Companions], among those even given glad tidings of Paradise, were among the people most repentant and turning to Allāh if one of them committed any sin.

Therefore, the issue that witnessing Badr is a preventer of Takfīr is incorrect and false speech; because they are not permitted to commit Kufr. The maximum they commit is sins; if they occur from them, then "Do whatever you wish" means errors and sins. But pardon and forgiveness [mean] that this sin accompanies them and bad deeds are written against them until the Day of Resurrection, but pardon does not mean he is pardoned from punishment. Meaning if a Badr participant committed a certain punishable offense or a *Ḥadd*, he is punished for it even if he was a Badr participant.

This is what happened with Qudāmah b. Maẓ‘ūn; Umar punished him and applied the *Ḥadd* on him. So their understanding of the issue is not like our understanding. The intent of "Do whatever you wish" does not mean "Do Kufr."

He says to you: How do you say that when the Messenger said this to Ḥāṭib while he was speaking about an apparent issue?

My brother, we have other context clues (*Qarā'in*), and this is the Book of our Lord. He says about His Prophets: "But if they had associated others with Allah, then worthless for them would be whatever they were doing." Do you compare the Prophets of Allāh to the people of Badr whatever their status?! And this is the Decisive (*Muḥkam*) saying of Allāh the Exalted.

Secondly, that Allāh says to His Prophet: "If you should associate [anything] with Allah, your work would surely become worthless." So we do not take the text and tear it from the context of other evidences. These other evidences are the Book of Allāh and these clear verses speaking that if these Prophets did this, this would be their punishment. If anyone had to be forgiven even if he committed Shirk, it would have been for the Prophets, and refuge is sought with Allāh, and far be it from them to do that. They are more deserving because they are the ones who conveyed Tawḥīd to people, and conveyed Shari'ah to them. Despite that, Allāh said regarding their right: "But if they had associated others with Allah, then worthless for them would be whatever they were doing," "If you should associate [anything] with Allah, your work would surely become worthless, and you would surely be among the losers."

Thus, the *Manāṭ* or justification by witnessing Badr is false speech and is not an argument. And I will tell you why the Messenger said "What would make you know? Perhaps Allāh..." We will say what is the reason for this, what is the intent by it here? What is the special characteristic? Because they say: Well, where is the special characteristic of the people of Badr here? We will speak about it later. So we finished **First**.

Second: Some justify the non-Kufr of Ḥāṭib by his saying, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam,* in the Ḥadīth: "He has indeed told you the truth."

When Ḥāṭib began clarifying his justifications saying "By Allāh, I did not apostatize nor disbelieve after my faith" and explaining his story to the Messenger, he said: "He has indeed told you the truth." Some say: The Preventer of Ḥāṭib's Kufr is that he did that, meaning this Apparent *Muwālāh*, for a worldly purpose, because he related that he has family and children and left them like that, and some Companions have relatives and families. So Heartfelt *Muwālāh* was negated from him, so the Messenger said: "He has indeed told you the truth." This is the justification and reasoning of those who say this.

Ḥāṭib informed of two matters: That he did what he did to protect his relatives in Mecca, and that he did not do it out of Kufr. And the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said that he was truthful in his saying. So did he believe him from the aspect of his saying conforming to his belief? Or from the aspect of its conformity to reality? Or from both aspects together?

We give an example for approximation: A blind man, we lit a lamp in front of him, so he said: "I see darkness." In this saying of his, he was truthful in his belief that there is darkness. But in reality, this speech of his does not match reality; the reality is that there is light. But he himself is truthful with himself because he is blind and does not see light, so he sees darkness. So this darkness he sees conforms to his belief. He says "I see darkness" and we say "Light exists" because we are sighted. So his speech contradicts reality but conforms to his own belief that there is darkness. I give it with an obvious example; some scholars of rhetoric speak about such matters, that one describes something in his belief which is contrary to reality.

So he said he did not do what he did of allying with disbelievers out of Kufr nor apostasy from the religion; meaning he did not do it with the **intent** of Kufr. So his truthfulness is from the aspect of conformity to his saying and belief and that he did not intend Kufr, and not from the aspect of its conformity to reality. This speech is his belief and his conformity to his internal self. As for reality, it is different from this. The reality is that the action he did, which is his *Muwālāh* for the disbelievers and his writing to the people of Mecca... that this is Apparent Kufr *Muwālāh* in itself. So his speech contradicts reality, even if the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* believed him in his saying according to his own belief. He says: "O Messenger of Allāh, I did this to protect my relatives and I did not do it out of apostasy and I am a believer and I am such-and-such." The Messenger said: "He told you the truth" in his saying regarding his own belief and his own declaration. But that does not mean that the action he did conforms to reality. The reality is that whoever does this action, it is Kufr in itself (Apparent *Muwālāh*).

What is the evidence for that? The evidence is His saying, Exalted is He: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them" [Sūrah Al-Mā’idah: 51]. These are clear verses. Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* did not speak about Heartfelt Negation nor Heartfelt *Muwālāh*. He speaks about a specific case; mere Apparent *Muwālāh* in itself is Kufr. This action is Kufr. After that, if we want to apply it to a specific person, this is another issue. When we ask about the specific person, we look into the controls of Takfīr and its preventers, and I will detail this later.

So he was truthful, and excused himself for his action by his fear for his relatives and that this is what drove him to this action. So his truthfulness here is from the aspect of the conformity of his saying to his belief, not from the aspect of its conformity to reality and truth. The truth is otherwise, which is that *Muwālāh* is Kufr; due to the establishment of evidence that mere fear without the occurrence of compelling coercion (*Ikrāh Mulji'*) is not licensed, naturally I will speak on Coercion later, and the difference between it and *Taqiyyah*, and the conditions of Coercion, the only case I am speaking about is Apparent *Muwālāh*. When is this Apparent *Muwālāh* permitted?

In one case which does not include fear for children nor family nor otherwise; there is nothing in it except cases of **Compelling Coercion**, and we will speak about it later, *In shā' Allāh,* in another lecture, but I only point to it.

So Kufr (*Muwālāh* of disbelievers) is not licensed by mere fear for children, offspring, and interest. All this is not considered and is disregarded.

Therefore, by mere evidences, the Messenger's, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, believing of Ḥāṭib is from the aspect of the agreement of his saying with his belief, not for conformity to reality. Based on this, the Prophet's, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, believing of him is not a validation (*Taṣwīb*) of his statement, nor does it indicate that what he did is not Kufr. Nor does it indicate that his excuse is correct and considered in Shari'ah. The evidence for that is what we said from the speech of Sheikh Sulaymān b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb when he considered in the verse of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah when He spoke that "Never will your relatives or your children benefit you." This speech is for Ḥāṭib: "Never will these relatives nor these moneys avail you." So Allāh disregarded it in Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah, and these are the excuses with which Ḥāṭib excused himself.

Lest they say that the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said "He has indeed told you the truth" meaning his proofs are correct. Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* did not consider them in the verse and disregarded them and considered that this is not acceptable and not permissible in Shari'ah.

Thus, the Messenger said "He has indeed told you the truth" in his saying, in the conformity of his saying to his belief when he declared that he did what he did to protect his relatives and that he did not apostatize and so on. So he is truthful in this, but it does not mean that the Messenger validates him. He says that he was truthful in this, but his action is an action

of Kufr. This *Muwālāh* is Kufr in itself and has nothing to do with "He has indeed told you the truth." I hope I have conveyed the issue to you.

Third: Some also justify the non-Kufr of Ḥāṭib by their saying that Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* said in Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah: "O you who have believed." He called him with "O you who have believed," and this indicates his non-Kufr.

This is naturally an error. Unfortunately, some scholars say this speech, and they are major scholars too who say such things. This is not evidence as they said; because Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* may address some people with "O you who have believed" by their previous action. For example, his saying, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, in a Ḥadīth in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*: "The blood of a Muslim man is not lawful except for one of three..." and among them is the **Abandoner of his religion**. This agreed-upon Ḥadīth contains "The Abandoner of his religion," and the Abandoner of his religion is the Apostate! How does he include him in the Ḥadīth "The blood of a Muslim man is not lawful", he named him a Muslim, although the Abandoner of his religion is an Apostate. He described him at the beginning of the Ḥadīth with Islam considering, as scholars said, considering his previous state; his state before that was upon Islam, so he addressed him by his previous state.

Therefore Ibn Ḥajar said in *Fatḥ al-Bārī*: "In this Ḥadīth is the permissibility of describing a person by what he was upon even if he transferred from it, due to his excepting the Apostate from the Muslims. It is considering what was." Meaning he was [Muslim] an hour ago and apostatized but he addresses him by the last state he was upon. Despite that, we addressed him with Islam even though the Abandoner of his religion is an Apostate; it means according to the last state he was upon.

There is also a Ḥadīth about the People of the Book: "Three are given their reward twice... and a man from the People of the Book who believed in his Prophet and believed in me." This Ḥadīth is agreed upon. He described him as People of the Book even though "he believed in his Prophet and believed in me." He is supposed to be described as a Muslim because he believed in his Prophet and believed in the Prophet [Muḥammad], and Islam erases what came before it. But his description "and a man from the People of the Book," this is, as Ibn Ḥajar says, by way of naming him by his previous state.

There are many verses, among them for example: "And from those who said, 'We are Christians'... they say, 'Our Lord, we have believed'." They said "We have believed," why does He call them Christians? He could have said: "They said, 'We are Muslims'" for example. He speaks about

their previous state. And His saying, Exalted is He: "O you who have believed, whoever of you reverts from his religion..." He says to the believers "whoever of you reverts." Does the address with Faith prevent the ascription [of Kufr] to some of them? Yes, some of these might... the address does not prevent. Some might be apostates included in this while the rest are believers. Therefore in Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah: "O you who have believed, do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies" to His saying: "And whoever does it among you has certainly strayed from the soundness of the way." So the address with Faith does not prevent the Kufr of some of those addressed.

In addition to something else, the verse said the address "O you who have believed" and did not address Ḥāṭib [specifically]. There is no text in the verse of Al-Mumtaḥanah: "O Muslim, O Believer, O Ḥāṭib." It does not exist. The address "O you who have believed" does not prevent one of the people from having committed Kufr or having disbelieved, even though we say that Ḥāṭib did not disbelieve specifically as a person. Because he has a preventer among the preventers of Takfīr. He did Kufr but he did not disbelieve due to the preventer of Takfīr.

Fourth: Someone says: Then what is the Preventer?

As long as the preventer "Do whatever you wish" for his witnessing Badr did not please you, nor the preventer of the Messenger's saying, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, "He has indeed told you the truth," nor the preventer of Fear for his relatives (i.e., the worldly purpose), for Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* clarified that "Never will your relatives or your children benefit you," all this speech is disregarded, and also the justification by his address "O you who have believed" because Allāh addressed him with this.

Even though we say even if He addressed him with "O you who have believed," we did not say that Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* has disbelieved. He did Kufr but the Preventer that prevented his Takfīr is Interpretation (*Ta'awwul*). What is the Preventer? This is what we will speak about now. It is the Preventer of Interpretation.

Before I speak on this issue, the brothers must pay attention to this subject: **The Definition of Interpretation (*Ta'wīl*)**.

Scholars have meanings all of which are close. Some meanings, as Al-Azharī says in *Tahdhīb al-Lughah*, he says: "Return (*Rujū'*), Outcome (*Ma'āl*), Consequence (*'Āqibah*), Reversion (*'Awd*), and Destiny (*Maṣīr*)."

All these are their explanations, and they quoted it from Ibn al-A'rābī and the great linguists; that it leads to return, outcome, consequence,

reversion, and destiny. Ibn Fāris, who died in the year 395 AH, says: "It is he returned the ruling to its people, meaning he returned it and restored it to them." And he cites some things. This is the first meaning: Return, Outcome, Consequence, Reversion, and Destiny. Because in His saying, Exalted is He: "Do they look for anything but its interpretation? The Day its interpretation comes, those who had ignored it before will say..." [QS. Al-A‘rāf: 53]. Meaning here: What it results in at the time of their resurrection and raising, meaning their consequence and destiny. They infer from the Quran on this.

The second famous meaning people know well is: **Explanation (*Tafsīr*) and Clarification (*Bayān*)**.

Of course, these interpretations are very many found among linguists. But there are books that spoke on Interpretation in detail. Among the best who spoke on this issue is Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, and the scholar Ibn al-Qayyim, and this blessed school. Ibn Taymiyyah refuted in his book in which he refuted Ibn Sab‘īn, one of the deviants, the people of Unity of Existence (*Waḥdat al-Wujūd*), he has a book *Bughyat al-Murtāb fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Mutafalsifah wa al-Qarāmiṭah wa al-Bāṭiniyyah Ahl al-Ilḥād min al-Qā’ilīn bi al-Ḥulūl wa al-Ittiḥād*. This treatise is found in *Al-Fatāwā al-Kubrā* and it is of utmost magnificence in refuting all the owners of these corrupt interpretations.

Although they were questions and Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah was in Alexandria at that time, he was exiled. In the year 409 [709 AH] approximately, Baybars Jāshankīr, who became Sultan and made a coup against King Al-Nāṣir, exiled him. They exiled him there in Alexandria. The goal of the exile was that perhaps one of the lads or one of the fanatical individuals with Ibn Makhlūf and followers of Ibn ‘Arabī, the people of Unity of Existence, might kill him. But praise be to Allāh, people welcomed him and sent him letters consisting of questions. There was a collection of Ḥadīths, "The first thing Allāh created was the Intellect," and this is a fabricated, lying Ḥadīth of course. He refuted it and refuted all this school which took interpretation and corrupted the religion. He refuted Ibn Sīnā, Al-Ghazālī, and all the scholars who philosophized in the *Ummah*. It is a very wonderful book.

And also Ibn al-Qayyim *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* in the book *Al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Mursalah* regarding breaking the Ṭāghūts of Interpretation and the terrible doubts they spoke about. There is a book by Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālikī who died in the year 543 AH titled *Qānūn al-Ta’wīl*. It is a good book in its chapter but not with the strength and value of *Al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Mursalah* by Ibn al-Qayyim, nor with the strength of the books *Bughyat al-*

Murtāb refuting Ibn Sab'īn, and *Dar' Ta'āruḍ al-'Aql wa al-Naql*. Ibn Taymiyyah's books are of utmost beauty to refer to.

So lest anyone say "Preventer of Interpretation... well, the whole world has the preventer of interpretation," there is a Considered Preventer of Interpretation and there is an Unconsidered Preventer of Interpretation. There is Corrupt Interpretation and there is Correct Interpretation. The interpretation to which the Arabic language testifies and to which the Holy Quran testifies, these are the Considered Interpretations. But naturally I will not delve much into definitions because the Salaf have very much speech and good speech on the subject of Interpretation. Whoever wants to refer to the books, he is welcome thankfully to these books.

But I would like to tell you that this Interpretation regarding what Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* did of Apparent *Muwālāh*... we told you that this action is Kufr, meaning **Absolute Takfīr**, but not Specific Takfīr (*Takfīr 'Aynī*). Absolute Takfīr is: Applying the ruling of Kufr to the **Abstract Cause** (*Sabab Mujarrad*), meaning committing a saying causing Kufr or an action causing Kufr. So it is said: "Whoever says such-and-such has disbelieved," "Whoever does this has disbelieved." Meaning knowing the ruling absolutely without applying the ruling of Kufr to a specific person, even if he has committed this cause.

Absolute Takfīr is the common one; you find the rulings with the scholars. But when they apply them to persons, here we resort to what is called **Controls of Takfīr (*Ḍawābiṭ al-Takfīr*)**, and we look at the conditions, the cause, and the preventers, and so on.

As for **Specific Takfīr**, its meaning is: Ruling with Kufr on the **Specific Person** who committed the Cause (i.e., the saying or action causing Kufr). Here, the characteristic of Kufr must be verified in his saying or action. So it requires that we look into the establishment of this cause upon its doer, and its freedom from preventers of rulings so that we can declare him a disbeliever.

So Absolute Takfīr is criminalizing the Action. In it, one matter is looked at: the Cause necessitating Takfīr abstractly in terms of its fulfilling the conditions and the characteristic that it is causing Takfīr from the aspect of Shar'ī evidence. As in *Muwālāh*, Allāh said: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them." Apparent *Muwālāh* regardless of the subject of Heartfelt Negation or Heartfelt Condition, because the text indicates that.

So Absolute Takfīr is criminalizing the Action. As for Specific Takfīr, you declare a specific person disbeliever; you declare a person

named ‘Alī or Zayd or other a disbeliever. Criminalizing the Doer. But we look at the state of this Doer: does he have insanity, does he have ignorance, does he have interpretation, did he err in a specific thing? And they are many preventers.

Therefore scholars divide preventers into: Preventers in the **Doer** and Preventers in the **Action**.

- **Preventers in the Doer:** It is what happens to him, what makes him not held accountable for his sayings and actions legally. These preventers which they call "Impediments of Competence" (*‘Awāriḍ al-Ahliyyah*).
- **Preventers in the Action:** Meaning in the Cause itself; such as the action not being explicit in Kufr, or the Shar‘ī evidence being non-definitive in indication of Kufr.
- **Preventers in Establishing the Action:** Perhaps one of the witnesses is not acceptable, for example, being a child or not upright (*‘Adl*) or insane or anything.
- There are impediments they call "**Acquired Impediments** (*Al-‘Awāriḍ al-Muktasabah*)", so we enter the subject of Error of Interpretation. Acquired Impediments, the slave has no hand in acquiring them himself or by another, although everything naturally is the Decree of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* "Indeed, all things We created with predestination" [QS. Al-Qamar: 49]. Among the Acquired Impediments considered as a preventer among the preventers of Takfīr: **Error leading to Slip of the Tongue**. One might err and his tongue slips and he pronounces Kufr while he does not intend it. This preventer invalidates the condition of Intent (*‘Amd*); meaning that the Mukallaf (accountable person) does Kufr intending it, but this one erred in speech. Evidence for that, considering error as a preventer, is the saying of the Exalted: "And there is no blame upon you for that in which you have erred but [only for] what your hearts intended" [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 5]. Also its evidence as a preventer of Takfīr is the Ḥadīth of the man who lost his mount in the desert as you know the narration. When it came to him and returned to him again, and he had despaired and sought shelter at a tree then placed his cheek on his hand until death comes to him... suddenly he finds his mount above his head. So he took it by its halter and from intense joy said: "O Allāh, You are my slave and I am your Lord." The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* described him: "He erred from intense joy." The Ḥadīth is agreed upon. So error that leads to a slip of the tongue like this man

who said "O Allāh, You are my slave" wanting to thank Allāh but erred from intense joy; and these are many.

The Second Preventer among Acquired Impediments: Error in Interpretation (*Ta'wīl*). *Ta'awwul*, we said, is Return, Destiny, and Explanation. As for the Shar'ī definition of *Ta'awwul*: It is **placing the Shar'ī evidence in other than its place** due to Ijtihād or a doubt arising from lack of understanding the indication of the text. So the Mukallaf proceeds to do Kufr while he does not see it as Kufr, arguing with an evidence whose meaning he erred in understanding. Like what Qudāmah b. Maẓ'ūn did and like what the Companion Ḥāṭib also did. So with this error, the condition of Intent is negated, and Error in Interpretation becomes a preventer of his Takfīr. If the Argument is established against him and his error is clarified to him, yet he persists on his action, he disbelieves. At that time he disbelieves. The first time we clarified his error to him and clarified the doubt to him and removed it for him, so if he returns and persists, this is the one who disbelieves.

Therefore in the Ḥadīth of Qudāmah b. Maẓ'ūn, when Qudāmah legalized drinking alcohol, he relied on the saying of Allāh the Exalted: "There is not upon those who believe and do righteousness [any] blame concerning what they have eaten [in the past]" [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 93]. He argued with this verse against Umar when he wanted to apply the *Ḥadd* on him. He said: "Why do you apply the *Ḥadd* on me? Allāh says: 'There is not upon those who believe and do righteousness [any] blame concerning what they have eaten.'" Meaning he argues by his precedence, his religion, and his previous faith that he can taste it. So Umar *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* clarified his error to him and applied the *Ḥadd* on him. Therefore Ibn Taymiyyah as in *Al-Fatāwā* says: "Or he erred and thought that those who believed and did righteousness are excepted from the prohibition of alcohol." He thought he was excepted, so this is his interpretation and from here his error occurred. "Just as those whom Umar asked to repent erred in that, and examples of that are many. So they are asked to repent and the Argument is established against them. If they persist, they disbelieve at that time, and they are not judged with Kufr before that. Just as the Companions did not judge with the Kufr of Qudāmah b. Maẓ'ūn and his companions when they erred in what they erred in of Interpretation." This was said by Ibn Taymiyyah in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*.

Thus, the incident of Qudāmah indicated that Error in Interpretation is a preventer of Takfīr by consensus of the Companions. Just as it enters into the generality of His saying, Exalted is He: "And there is no blame upon you for that in which you have erred."

But not every Error in Interpretation is considered an acceptable excuse and a preventer. Error in Interpretation does not excuse one who interprets by mere **Pure Opinion and Desire (*Hawā*)**. As in the corrupt interpretations of these Kharijites and the interpretations of those who declared the Companions disbelievers by way of doubts and very many verses they took and interpreted. Therefore they were the first who interpreted, i.e., the Kharijites. Then after that all sects; the Mu‘tazilah and the Rawāfiḍ. All these... the crime of Interpretation that happened here in the subject of Interpretation happened from these people from the beginning that they erred and understood incorrectly, and some of it was via Desire.

For example, the Rawāfiḍ when they slaughter a cow and say it is Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah, and interpret prayer to the Kaaba as prayer to ‘Alī. Is this Interpretation?! This is play and absurdity as Abū Bakr Ibn al-‘Arabī says.

Iblis himself when he did his deed argued by Desire, and Allāh did not accept that from him. "He said, 'I am better than him. You created me from fire and created him from clay'" [QS. Ṣād: 76]. This is his interpretation; justifying his refusal to prostrate to Adam arguing by the purity of his substance and that he is superior to the one created from clay. So these are false interpretations having no consideration.

Even the Withholders of Zakat, for example, Abū Bakr *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* did not accept from them, and by consensus of the Companions, and fought them. And they acknowledged all laws of Islam, and regarding Zakat they did not deny it, lest anyone think they denied it, they argued by the saying of the Exalted: "Take, [O, Muhammad], from their wealth a charity by which you purify them and cause them increase" [QS. Al-Tawbah: 103]. "Take from their wealth" meaning take, O Muḥammad. They said: The address was to the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and the Messenger has died, so no one can take it after the Messenger. Notice the doubt is not easy. This doubt is stronger than the doubts of even those who permit entering Parliaments that legislate with other than what Allāh has revealed. This is stronger than their doubts; because it relies on a text. Despite that, Abū Bakr *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* and the Companions did not accept this interpretation and did not accept this argument and excuse, and considered that this is a Corrupt and False Interpretation, and an error by relying on verses while Zakat is a pillar of the pillars of religion. But they did not accept it as interpretation. Thus, not any interpretation is accepted.

And Sheikh Al-Muʻallimī *raḥmatullāhi ʻalayhi*, the great scholar, has a book *Ḥaqīqat al-Ta'wīl* (The Reality of Interpretation), a good book also in this chapter. But the best books absolutely are the books of refutations by Sheikh Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim on this subject.

So the Error in Interpretation by which a human is excused arises from looking into the Sharʻī evidence, erring in its understanding. This is what actually happened in the incident of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Baltaʻah. He erred in his understanding of this letter, so he thought that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* was protected (*mamnūʻ*), and that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* would be victorious inevitably, and that this speech only protects his family. This is an interpretation he erred in naturally. For how do you perform an action of Kufr claiming that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* will be victorious over the army of disbelievers anyway, and this is by way of warning them so even this warning of theirs will not suffice, for they will not be able to do anything and the Messenger will invade them inevitably?! So this is an error in his understanding here; he erred in Interpretation.

So this Preventer (Error in Interpretation) applied to what Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhu* did. As Ibn Taymiyyah says: "If the mistaken interpreter in those matters is not judged with Kufr except after clarification to him and seeking his repentance, as the Companions did regarding the group who legalized alcohol, then in other than that it is more appropriate and worthy." So the human who has Error in Interpretation, we do not judge with his Kufr before clarifying to him, but his action is described as Kufr. People who have doubts present. But in other subjects where such things do not exist, he disbelieves and it does not require that we seek details from him in other clear issues unlike this.

So the story of Ḥāṭib, because it contains a Ḥadīth and the Messenger spoke with him, it is closer to the Ambiguous (*Mutashābih*) for those who inferred the non-Kufr of Ḥāṭib's action, due to "What would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr and said Do whatever you wish," and also "He has indeed told you the truth." So because there is no explicit text in this issue, therefore it became open to interpretation. Thus we search for the effective cause necessitating Takfīr actually in Ḥāṭib's action, or the basic reason (*ʻIllah*): it is the Preventer of Interpretation which aligns and fits with the texts.

Last time I reviewed for you the sayings of the scholars who said that this is an error of interpretation and that the preventer of his Kufr is thus, like Ibn Ḥajar and others and like Ibn Al-Jawzī. I do not want to repeat, but lest anyone think that we did not rely on the sayings of scholars.

No, we mentioned the speech of Judge Abū Ya‘lā and others. This is the speech of scholars from long ago. This is the speech of major scholars of the *Ummah* who said this. These are the ones who were able to scrutinize this preventer and distinguish it from other preventers, and were able to say why Ḥāṭib did not disbelieve as a person? Because there is a preventer: he erred in Interpretation.

Fifth Item: Why did the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* not seek Ḥāṭib's repentance and clarify to him as long as Ḥāṭib was interpreting?

If the mistaken interpreter must be asked to repent and it be clarified to him, as happened to Qudāmah b. Maẓ‘ūn, he clarified to him and argued against him with verses but after that applied the *Ḥadd* on him. So *Istitābah* (seeking repentance) means originally asking for repentance from someone, for example, who was judged with apostasy and Kufr; we offer him repentance. But scholars sometimes apply it before the judgment of apostasy, meaning clarifying to him the state he is in. Well, why did the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* not seek his repentance? The Messenger clarified Ḥāṭib's state. He said to him: "What is this, O Ḥāṭib?" So this is the Clarification (*Istibyān*). So Ḥāṭib showed his excuse which was considered a preventer of his Takfīr, i.e., Interpretation. He says to you: Here he must inform him of his error and the mistake and obscenity he did. Well, Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* mentioned the obscenity of what he did in Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah. For the first of these verses is a rebuke to Ḥāṭib and his action and what he committed: "Never will your relatives or your children benefit you." Thus these moneys will not benefit nor the relatives, they will not avail.

So Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* guaranteed this clarification in denouncing and making ugly the action of Ḥāṭib in the first verses of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah. Therefore Allāh the Exalted said, and is there any clarification better and superior to this clarification? "And whoever does it among you has certainly strayed from the soundness of the way." This indicates the ugliness of Ḥāṭib's action in this. And His saying, Exalted is He: "Never will your relatives or your children benefit you on the Day of Resurrection. He will judge between you. And Allah, of what you do, is Seeing." This is a clarification of his error in what he excused himself with. Even what he excused himself with, Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* clarified that it is error. So making excuses with worldly purpose, children, and others; all this is not a justification nor a warrant to ally with the disbelievers, meaning to commit Shirk and to commit Kufr. After Allāh the Exalted frightened him regarding his family and child, so he is not licensed

in what he proceeded upon, for they will not benefit him at all if Allāh is angry with him.

Sixth: He did not inflict a punishment on him?

Meaning why did the Messenger not inflict a punishment on him for what he did? Even if we said his action is Kufr but he erred and this is a preventer among preventers of Takfīr, punish him as Umar later punished Qudāmah b. Maẓ'ūn and those who drank alcohol legalizing it and interpreted the verse of Sūrah Al-Mā'idah. Thus, why did he not inflict punishment on him?

There are *Ḥadd* sins and non-*Ḥadd* sins. *Ḥadd* sins are stipulated by text; like the *Ḥadd* of Zina (adultery) and the *Ḥadd* of Alcohol. These have a fixed punishment by text whether in the Quran or Sunnah. And there are sins, and how many they are, that are not fixed and have no fixed text. These are the ones subject to **Discretionary Punishments (*'Uqūbāt Ta'zīriyyah*)**. We say it is the right of the Guardian (*Walī al-Amr*) or Sultan or Ruler to see the estimated punishment necessary for him.

Qudāmah b. Maẓ'ūn and Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah both did what is Kufr; because the first legalized alcohol and it is Kufr, and the second did Kufr and allied with disbelievers (Apparent Kufr Alliance). But the preventer of their Takfīr is Error in Interpretation (Excuse of Interpretation). Why did Umar apply the *Ḥadd* here and not apply it to the other even though both are Badr participants? This punishment which Umar applied is because it is a *Ḥadd* punishment. Qudāmah b. Maẓ'ūn drank alcohol and alcohol has a *Ḥadd* in Shari'ah. So this one was flogged; Umar flogged him and applied the *Ḥadd* on him for the punishment of alcohol. As for Ḥāṭib, his punishment has no fixed limit (*Ḥadd*). There is no text on this punishment, on the action he did (*Muwālāh*), because *Muwālāh* is Kufr expelling from the Millah. If he disbelieved, he would be an apostate and that's it and his neck would be struck. But due to the existence of the Preventer of Interpretation, he was excused. So Qudāmah's sin was a *Ḥadd* sin (drinking alcohol) so the *Ḥadd* was not dropped from him by his witnessing Badr.

Did the Messenger not say: "Do whatever you wish"? Did he not say regarding Ḥāṭib to Umar and the Companions: "What would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr and said: Do whatever you wish"? Well, Qudāmah did afterwards in the days of Umar indeed (drank alcohol); why did Umar not drop it from him even though he witnessed Badr?

Because witnessing Badr does not mean the punishment is dropped from him. This witnessing of Badr, the special characteristic in it is that Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* pardons their sins, that Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* is aware of them that they are frequent in seeking forgiveness and that even if they commit a sin, they return and seek forgiveness. As for our Master Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah, the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* did not punish him because the punishment has no fixed text in Shari'ah, and this is a Discretionary Punishment (*Ta‘zīriyyah*) subject to the Legal Guardian. Therefore the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* sufficed with Ḥāṭib with this which happened. And this is the Special Characteristic (Characteristic of the People of Badr), that such matters can be pardoned with these people. So he pardoned him and sufficed with what was revealed of verses in the beginning of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah.

Summary here on the subject of Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu*:

- That Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* allied with the disbelievers and backed them against the Muslims, and revealed regarding him was "O you who have believed, do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies."
- That allying with disbelievers is Kufr without stipulating that it be coupled with Heartfelt *Muwālāh*, as claimed by those who say Heartfelt *Muwālāh* must be stipulated. That is due to His saying, Exalted is He: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them." And Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* refuted their claim "We are afraid a misfortune may strike us," so all this is disregarded and false.
- That Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* committed Kufr and not a sin as some think. And we said that Umar erred in applying the ruling to the Specific Person, but Ḥāṭib's action was Kufr. The Preventer of Application to Ḥāṭib which prevented his Takfīr is the Preventer of Interpretation which we spoke about.
- That Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* did not disbelieve due to the existence of a preventer among preventers of Takfīr in his right, which is Interpretation even if he erred in it. And the preventer is not his witnessing Badr, as some thought.
- That the Preventer, even if it prevented his Takfīr, did not prevent his deserving punishment as *Ta‘zīr*. Even if there is a preventer, yes it prevents his Takfīr but it is permissible that he be punished later, whether by Discretionary Punishment as we said in the story of Qudāmah b. Maẓ‘ūn. And we will discuss this in detail later

regarding the difference of scholars on the subject of the Spy: is he killed or not killed, and what is the ruling on the Spy.

- Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah had two preventers established in his right; the First Preventer: is Interpretation even if he erred in it. The Second Preventer: a preventer from his *Ta'zīr*, which is his witnessing Badr.
- If Ḥāṭib's action was a normal sin, Umar would not have said: "Let me strike the neck of this hypocrite, he has betrayed Allāh and His Messenger." Because he knows that Apparent *Muwālāh* in itself is Kufr. And the Messenger did not fault Umar in that, but the error came in Umar's application of Takfīr to the Specific Person. But Ḥāṭib's action was Kufr, but the Application to the Person, the preventer of it was Interpretation, which we spoke about.

And the discussion has a remainder, *In shā' Allāh*, because there are some doubts and other issues specific to this matter. We will speak about these *Manāṭs* causing Takfīr for allying with disbelievers. Because allying with disbelievers in itself is Kufr naturally, but those who divide *Muwālāh* into Major *Muwālāh* and Minor *Muwālāh*, meaning *Muwālāh* causing Takfīr and *Muwālāh* not causing Takfīr, this is a recent division by scholars.

But the origin is that *Muwālāh* is Major Kufr in itself, and does not require Heartfelt *Muwālāh*, and this is a false condition. But some scholars placed issues, like some scholars of the Najdi Call placed all forms in the form of *Muwālāh*, so they divided it because they found the one who trades with disbelievers, and the one who buys and sells, and the one who marries from the People of the Book. So they placed all these forms into *Muwālāh* even though in reality they are not of *Muwālāh* in anything.

So any human who allies with a polytheist outwardly, this is a *Manāṭ* causing Takfīr in itself. The one who fights with them and supports them, this is another *Manāṭ* because he fights. What are the evidences for that? The first *Manāṭ* is that you ally with disbelievers, and Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* says: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them" [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 51]. So whoever fights with the disbelievers is another *Manāṭ* in itself; because Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* says: "They wish to refer legislation to Taghut" [QS. Al-Nisā': 60]. And He says: "And those who disbelieve fight in the cause of Taghut" [QS. Al-Nisā': 76]. Thus, this is a *Manāṭ* causing Takfīr by itself. You go to ally with those who show enmity to Allāh and His Messenger; this in its limit is another *Manāṭ* causing Takfīr for those who show enmity to Allāh and His Messenger. "Whoever is an enemy to Allah and His angels and His

messengers and Gabriel and Michael - then indeed, Allah is an enemy to the disbelievers" [QS. Al-Baqarah: 98]. So when you ally with those who show enmity to Allāh and His Messenger, then you are an enemy to Allāh and His Messenger, and this is a *Manāṭ* causing Takfīr in itself.

So several *Manāṭs* might gather in one person. Meaning the *Manāṭ* of Apparent *Muwālāh* and Support by tongue and speech is a *Manāṭ* causing Takfīr. If he participated with them and invaded with them or fought with them, this is another issue as well, this is another *Manāṭ* causing Takfīr. If he declared that he shows enmity to them [believers], this is a *Manāṭ* as well. It is not required that all these *Manāṭs* gather, although mostly they are gathered with those who do that.

I fear prolonging more than this. There are many things we want to complete but we defer them to the next lesson *In shā' Allāh*. May Allāh bless you, and may Allāh reward you with all good. We ask Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* to help us and you.

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Seventh Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We praise Him for all good; we thank Him and are not ungrateful to Him. We cast off and forsake those who disobey Him. O Allāh, You alone we worship, to You we pray and prostrate, and towards You we strive and hasten. We hope for Your mercy and fear Your punishment; surely, Your serious punishment will overtake the disbelievers. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Honored brothers, here we are with the seventh lecture among the lectures on *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. Today, *bi idhnillāh Ta'ālā*, we will speak about issues related to the subject of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. It is also a branch of the subject of the story of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*. We will speak about the subject of the **Ruling on the Spy**, and there is an issue related to the spy as well, which is the issue of **Coercion (*Ikrāh*)**.

We will speak on this subject, *In shā' Allāh*, then if there is remaining time, we will speak about the difference between Coercion and *Taqiyyah* (Precaution/Dissimulation), because there is confusion in this issue.

First: We will speak about: **The Ruling on the Muslim Spy**, they call him thus in Shari'ah, and the jurists of old say about him "The Ruling on the Muslim Spy", because there is the *Dhimmī* Spy and the *Ḥarbī* Spy. I will not speak about these other spies; we are speaking about the ruling on the Muslim spy, because it has a relation to *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*, and it has a relation to backing (*Muẓāharah*) the polytheists.

Naturally, this subject of the spy requires several lectures, not a single lecture. However, as much as possible, I will try to be concise without defect in understanding the subject so we can comprehend the issue easily and smoothly, *In shā' Allāh*, and summarize the opinions of the jurists on this issue, meaning what is called "Espionage in Islam" or "The Ruling on the Muslim Spy."

In short, this espionage or spying, scholars differed regarding the ruling on this spy and killing this spy. The Three Imams, meaning in general, because there are details in every school, the Three Imams: Al-Shāfi'ī, Aḥmad, and Abū Ḥanīfah; their school is the impermissibility of killing the spy. As for the Mālikīs, it is permissible according to them to kill him even if he is from the Muslims, and he is not asked to repent, nor

is there blood money (*Diyah*) for him according to them, this is generally speaking, because there are details and branches even in the Mālikī school itself.

Espionage is described by some as a type of backing (*Muẓāharah*) the polytheists by being an eye (*‘Ayn* - spy). For the spy is the eye that strives in the land causing corruption, and it is a type of backing disbelievers against Muslims. The cause of the problem is that the old image of the subject of espionage or the spy in the image likened long ago is as if it is the image of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* when he sent the letter and divulged the secret of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. So they considered that he divulged the secret and informed, thus this is a spy and this is a type of Apparent *Muwālāh*.

And because the scholars of old, as we told you, had a problem in the issue due to the text of the Ḥadīth of the story of Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* with the sayings of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* which we detailed before, so there are doubts (*Shubuhāt*) in the subject. Therefore some say: He committed a prohibited action, as we told you, and did not reach the issue of Apostasy (*Riddah*). And naturally they have interpretations which we spoke about. And some said: He committed an action causing Kufr but he did not disbelieve because he erred in interpretation, but the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* did not inflict the punishment on him (kill him, that is) because he is from the people of Badr. This is the special characteristic, and because this punishment fundamentally is not stipulated by text like the *Ḥadd* punishments which have specific text like theft for example or Zina. So the disagreement came from here.

Therefore, those who say it is not permissible to kill him visualize it on this simple issue: someone corresponded and the matter ended, as if it was once and it ended. But the matter in our present era differs completely from the spy of old. Espionage of old differs from espionage currently; the spy currently is a cog among the cogs of an integrated system for the enemies of Islam. This man who used to send a letter, or via carrier pigeon, or via any other human means, and they were simple messages. But now the spy is a missile, is a B-52 plane, is a Tomahawk, is time bombs that destroy. The one who places a chip in a specific mosque might kill a complete mosque and the entire neighborhood explodes because of this spy.

And what we see and hear of these spies who cause human losses and kill the innocent, killing hundreds and tens of innocent people. So this

image you see... because some people are confused: How do jurists say that this spy is not killed? And how do these differ and say he is not an apostate, meaning he committed a major sin, or that his affair is up to the Imam?! Because they are speaking about old terminologies and simple old subjects. And scholars of old were focusing on the text with the content, meaning this subject of Ḥāṭib as evidence, and speaking about the subject of Ḥāṭib as if all spies are like Ḥāṭib for example, *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*. Although our Master Ḥāṭib, as we shall see, was not like these people. Our Master Ḥāṭib was not a member of the army of the disbelievers of Quraysh! And he was not receiving a salary from them! And even the letter he sent, he did not send it in the manner of "They will move on such a day and in such place" and setting ambushes and plans for them. For the spy now plans with the disbelievers too!

But the maximum he did was say that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* came to you with an army you cannot withstand. And he knew the Messenger would be victorious inevitably, and that they cannot overcome, in order to save his children and family who were in Mecca with the disbelievers of Quraysh at that time. And this is his error in interpretation.

So there is a completely different subject. The one who spies on Muslims and transmits their news, especially what relates to the nakedness (*'awrāt*) of Muslims, the best of Muslims, and innocent lives, and transmits to them the vital and sensitive places... this spy first allied with the disbelievers, and he is also a killer person participating in killing with these criminals who destroy. And he strives in the land causing corruption; because what does the spy want? He strives in the land causing corruption.

We are speaking about the **Muslim Spy**. Perhaps a speaker says: And is there a Muslim spy? If we judged that he is an apostate, why do we call him a Muslim spy?

We told you a rule before that this naming is based on his previous state, meaning before his [current] state he was a Muslim. So his name is the Muslim Spy based on his previous state for those who view he is an apostate. As for those who do not view he is an apostate, because they have conditions and specific forms, they view him as having committed a major sin, and in their minds, what Ḥāṭib did is not an action causing Kufr. This is the problem here and this is the cause of disagreement with those who speak on this issue.

Therefore they differed regarding killing him as I told you. Naturally, the most correct and famous of opinions is killing this spy, whether he was a Muslim, a *Mu'āhad* (covenanted), or a *Musta'man*

(granted security); this is absolutely. As for those who said he is not killed if he is Muslim, they said he is punished with severe punishments and intense punishments, and the reason for that is the doubt of the Ḥadīth of Ḥāṭib. We told you that Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* committed an action causing Kufr but did not disbelieve personally, due to his error in interpretation, and interpretation is a preventer among the preventers of Takfīr.

But notice even the inference of [Ibn] al-Qayyim when he says: "And in it —meaning the story of Ḥāṭib— is the permissibility of killing the spy even if he is Muslim, because Umar *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* asked the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* to kill Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘ah when he sent to inform the people of Mecca of the news. And the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* did not say: 'His killing is not lawful because he is a Muslim.' Rather, he said: 'And what would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr and said: Do whatever you wish.'"

So the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* knows that the preventer here is that he interpreted and erred. Therefore, he clarifies to Umar that his speech was correct in the issue of the action causing Kufr, but the error in the subject of our Master Umar is that he applied it to him specifically, because he was saying he disbelieved, and in a narration: that he betrayed Allāh and His Messenger. So he declares him a disbeliever in his person, and not just the action. So he declares him a disbeliever in his person here because he committed this action. The Messenger did not object that the action is Kufr but clarified to him that "What would make you know..." So what prevented the application of this punishment on him is that he erred in interpretation, so he did not disbelieve. Thus Ḥāṭib did not disbelieve fundamentally here.

The point in this subject: is the permissibility of killing the spy. Why? Because the Messenger did not say to him "We do not kill him." So it means killing the spy is permissible. The funny thing is that those who say it is not permissible to kill the spy infer with the same narration! He says: And the evidence for that is the action of Ḥāṭib, that the Messenger did not kill him! We told you why? Because firstly: Our Master Ḥāṭib did not disbelieve. Secondly: If there was a punishment, it belongs to the Imam, and this punishment has no text. And because the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* due to the precedence and context clues of the situation regarding him; because he witnessed Badr, sacrificed, migrated, was truthful, and did very many actions, so he said: "What would make you know? Perhaps Allāh looked upon the people of Badr and said: Do whatever you wish." So here this is a special characteristic for the people

of Badr in this case, by context clues and his witnessing of Badr, and this is an incident wherein he erred in interpretation. But if he erred and disbelieved and had no preventer among preventers of Takfīr, he would have disbelieved and the punishment would have been inflicted upon him.

And we spoke about these doubts. Even the Prophets, Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* warned them and clarified that, and His saying to the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*: "If you should associate [anything] with Allah, your work would surely become worthless."

So the spy, according to these scholars, some say he is killed, and some say he is not killed. Those who said he is killed [say so] in any case. Even those who say the Muslim spy committed a major sin, they also say to kill him. They say it is permissible to kill him if the Imam sees that and there is an interest (*Maṣlaḥah*), or they say it is permissible to kill him as policy (*Siyāsah*). As the Ḥanafīs do; the Ḥanafīs, for example, do not hold the opinion of killing the spy, although they are among the people who most apply killing to the spy from a practical aspect. Even notice in Pakistan and Afghanistan and these regions, they are Ḥanafīs, yet despite that they are the people who kill spies the most, and they hardly pardon a spy. Although the Fiqh they have, the Mullahs and Jurists and Mawlawis there, know the ruling in their books that the spy according to them is not killed but punished with a severe or intense punishment or made an example of or otherwise. But they say and justify that as being killed by policy, by way of interest that he be killed in this case. Meaning it is permissible to keep him alive and permissible to kill him if there is an interest, but they mostly kill him, on the basis that he is killed by policy.

But there are those who say he is killed for **Apostasy (*Riddah*)** and not as a *Ḥadd* (prescribed punishment) like this; meaning he disbelieved and exited the Millah. Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in *Al-Ikhtiyārāt* says: "Whoever jumps to the camp of the Tatars and joins them has apostatized, and his wealth and blood become lawful." Meaning one is a Muslim and joins the army of the Tatars at that time, meaning the army of disbelievers. So he says he apostatized and his wealth became lawful because he went to another camp.

And Sheikh Rashīd Riḍā also has speech on this. He said: "And likewise everyone who joined the disbelievers warring against the Muslims and assisted them against them. It is explicit in His saying, Exalted is He: 'And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them.'" Sheikh Rashīd Riḍā is the author of *Al-Manār*. Naturally, Sheikh Rashīd Riḍā has very many problems in issues of Creed, creedal doubts and specific doubts, but in general he has good speech.

And also Ibn al-Qayyim says in *Aḥkām Ahl al-Dhimmah*: "That Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* has judged, and no judgment is better than His, that whoever allies with the Jews and Christians is of them: 'And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them.' So if their allies are of them by the text of the Quran, they have their ruling. This is general; specified from it is whoever allies with them and enters into their religion after adhering to Islam, then he is not affirmed nor is Jizyah accepted from him; rather either Islam or the sword, for he is an Apostate by text and consensus." So these view that the spy is an Apostate. And pay attention that they are speaking about the spy from the old perspective!

And Sheikh Aḥmad Shākir has a major fatwa in *Kalimat al-Ḥaqq*, his famous book, when he spoke about Egypt which was occupied by the British at that time. This is a famous fatwa you all know. When asked about cooperation with the British, he said: "As for cooperation with the British, by any type of cooperation, little or much, it is unbridled Apostasy (*Riddah Jāmiḥah*) and clear Kufr. No excuse is accepted for it, no interpretation (*Ta'wīl*) avails with it, nor does foolish tribalism/nationalism nor clumsy politics nor courtesy save from its ruling. It is Hypocrisy. Whether that is from individuals, governments, or leaders; all of them are equal in Kufr and Apostasy." So he declares disbelievers even governments and individuals and whoever has this.

Naturally there is a doubt, someone reminds me about the subject of Sheikh Aḥmad Shākir because he has other actions sometimes people get confused about. When you are confused about an action in the deed of a certain Sheikh who gave such a fatwa... And he also has another fatwa when they asked him about the French occupation in Algeria and elsewhere, so he applied the same subject and said: "It is not permissible for a Muslim in any spot of the earth to cooperate with them by any type of cooperation. Cooperation with them —meaning the French— has the ruling of cooperation with the British: Apostasy and exiting from Islam completely, whatever the color, type, or gender of the cooperator with them." This is the speech of Sheikh Aḥmad Shākir, summarized and decisive as well.

However, Sheikh Aḥmad Shākir has an individual action sometimes, for example, meeting a minister or doing a certain thing. We are speaking about the writing he wrote; this is what is used as evidence. As we said, for example, like our Master Abū Hurayrah; he is the one who narrated the Ḥadīth: "If a dog licks the vessel of one of you, let him wash it seven times, one of them with dust, or wash it eight times one of them with dust." He is the one who narrated this narration. Meaning wash seven times and one of them with dust, and in a narration eight. He himself used

to do otherwise! He used to wash three times. And some Ḥanafīs took from this based on his action. Therefore scholars differed: He says such-and-such and does otherwise, what do we take?

We must take his saying; meaning the Ḥadīth he narrated is the proof. As for his action, he might have forgotten, and he might have overlooked something due to the length of time or anything, so it has more than one justification. So we must adhere to the speech he said. If his speech contradicts his action, we prioritize, according to some jurists, and they are many, the speech he narrated over his action, because there might be some doubt that occurred to him. Especially since he narrates from the Messenger of Allāh; he says "The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said," "The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* told me," "I saw the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* doing such-and-such." So he knows "Whoever lies about me intentionally, let him take his seat in the Fire."

So we take this text because he speaks about the Messenger of Allāh. He knows that lying about the Messenger of Allāh means that if he legalizes it, he disbelieves. Therefore we take the speech he spoke about the Messenger of Allāh, for it is a testimony from him, and Ḥadīth from the Messenger of Allāh is testimony. He might have forgotten what he mentioned before, or he has a certain interpretation. But we must adhere to the speech he narrated from the Messenger of Allāh. Because we worship Allāh by what the Messenger said, not by what the Companion himself narrated [of his own opinion], his own speech and his own action. We must adhere to the action of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* or the saying of the Messenger or the approval of the Messenger. This is an issue found in the science of Ḥadīth you can search for.

Therefore, we take the speech of Sheikh Aḥmad Shākir, not his action.

So espionage for the benefit of enemies against Muslims is considered among the greatest, most dangerous, and gravest things in this religion: that a human spies for the benefit of enemies. Because as long as he spies, then he allied with the disbelievers and showed them loyalty, so he is of them. Then what religion is this that makes a human spy knowing that he will cause infliction of harm (*Nikāyah*)?! The man searches for a spot and place to harm Muslims! So how do you compare him to one who frightens the disbelievers and tells them "The army of the Messenger of Allāh is an army you cannot withstand, and it is coming to you," frightening them? While the other searches for points of weakness, searches for a place to harm Muslims, and harm the innocent, and gives information. Meaning

this is an employee taking a wage for harming Muslims. So how do we liken him to the old image, this image scholars spoke about and launched from the story of the image that occurred and the action of our Master Ḥāṭib with the disbelievers! There is a huge difference between the two subjects. Despite that, we said the action of Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* in itself is an action causing Takfīr, but he did not disbelieve as a person due to Interpretation.

Even among current scholars, naturally despite their contradictions unfortunately, like Sheikh Ibn Bāz and others... he himself has speech saying: "The scholars of Islam have agreed that whoever backs (*ẓāhara*) the disbelievers against the Muslims and helps them by any type of help, he is a disbeliever like them." Well, come apply this to the subject of Coalition Forces and forces striking Afghanistan and which struck Iraq and those destroying and others; isn't this backing (*Muẓāharah*)?

Sheikh Ibn Bāz also says: "As for the Belligerent Disbelievers (*Kuffār Ḥarbiyyūn*), it is not permissible to help them with anything; because helping them against Muslims is among the Nullifiers of Islam due to His saying, *‘Azza wa Jalla*: 'And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them.'" But naturally you know politics, pressures, stories, and tales unfortunately make these scholars contradict themselves in many things. But we are concerned with what they wrote and penned.

We have even the scholar Al-Kattānī detailed this issue briefly and quoted speech of the Mālikī Imams when he said regarding the spy under the chapter: "The spy is killed even if he shows repentance after his capture." He said in *Sharḥ al-Mawāhib* after speaking on the issue of Ḥāṭib: "And the saying of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* regarding him to Umar: 'Did he not witness Badr?' - its text as Al-Suhaylī said: In it is evidence for killing the spy due to his suspending the ruling of prevention from killing on witnessing Badr. This indicated that whoever did like him and is not a Badr participant is killed. The spy who views the nakedness (*‘awrāt*) of Muslims and transmits their news to the enemy; it is said he is the Messenger of Evil, and he is also called the Eye (*Al-‘Ayn*), because he is the one who helps (*yu‘īn*) the disbelievers. Our scholars, meaning Mālikī scholars, *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhum* decided: That spies are killed if their being spies becomes apparent, even if they show repentance after their capture. If they come repenting before being discovered, they are accepted. Khalīl said in the Chapter of Apostasy: 'And the concealer (*Mustasirr*) is killed without seeking repentance unless he comes repenting.' And he said in Jihad: 'And a spy (*‘ayn*) is killed even if a Dhimmī granted security, and the Muslim is like the *Zindīq* (Heretic)'", meaning he is killed as well.

Al-Kattānī also says regarding one of the Mālikī Imams: "Al-Lakhmī said: He means unless the Imam sees enslaving him. If it is proven that a Muslim acted as a spy (*'ayn*) for them, Al-Lakhmī has five [opinions]: —meaning sections— Al-'Utbī narrated, from Mālikī books: The Imam exercises Ijtihād regarding him. Ibn Wahb said he is killed unless he repents. Ibn al-Qāsim and Saḥnūn: There is no repentance for him. 'Abd al-Malik: If it was once from him and his ignorance is thought probable and his lack of return, and he is not among the people suspected regarding Islam, he is made an example of; and the habitual one is killed. Some of our companions said: He is flogged, his imprisonment prolonged, and he is exiled to what is far from the Abode of War (*Dār al-Ḥarb*)."

He said very much speech I do not want to burden you with, and they are divisions among them. Even Ibn Farḥūn in *Tabṣirat al-Ḥukkām* says: "Saḥnūn said regarding the Muslim who writes to the People of War with our news, he said: He is killed and not asked to repent, nor is there blood money for his heirs, like the *Muḥārib* (one waging war against society). It was said he is flogged as an example, his imprisonment prolonged, and exiled from the place he was in. It was said he is killed unless he repents. It was said unless he is excused by ignorance. It was said he is killed if he is habitual to that, and if it was a slip, he is beaten and made an example of."

But Sheikh Al-Kattānī gave us a practical example that happened in the days of the Mujahid Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jazā'irī at that time, when he quoted and said: "And in the answer of Sheikh Al-Tasūlī to Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Ḥājj 'Abd al-Qādir, the text of which is: So the Muslims, if they show inclination to the disbelieving enemy and are fanatical for him, they are fought the fighting of disbelievers and their wealth is *Fay'* (booty). Imām Sīdī Aḥmad b. Zakarī was asked about tribes of Arabs whose affairs mixed with the Christians and affection arose between them, such that if the Muslims wanted to raid, these tribes informed the Christians, so the Muslims find them only cautious and prepared. The intent is that Muslims do not reach Jihad except from the lands of these tribes, and perhaps they fought the Muslims along with the Christians. What is the ruling of Allāh regarding their blood and wealth? Are they exiled from the land? And what if they refuse exile except by fighting?

He answered, *raḥimahullāh*, by his saying, meaning Imām Sīdī Aḥmad b. Zakarī from whom Al-Kattānī quoted: 'What the mentioned people were described with necessitates fighting them and killing them like the disbelievers whom they allied with. And whoever allies with the disbelievers, then he is of them. Allāh the Exalted said: 'O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact]

allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them.'" [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 51]"

"And in the biography *Nuzhat al-Ḥādī* in the biography of the military expeditions of Sīdī Muḥammad al-‘Ayyāshī, the text of which is: Among them is the Battle of the Great Throat (*Ḥalq*), and he did not attend it because he went to Tangier." I will summarize for you because it is a long issue. He says they wanted to invade Andalusia, and they called it the Battle of the Nails (*Masāmīr*). They were placing nails and made them snares; they made a nail with three heads. This nail lands on the ground and hinders movement, enters people's feet and tires them, and horses, and everything. The important thing is that some tribes at that time, tribes ascribed to Islam, were hindering movement and were the ones conspiring and did that with the Muslims.

Some Sheikhs, when asked about the ruling of these tribes and the ruling of those guiding the Christians in Andalusia against the Muslims, did not understand the issue and judged theoretically. So they did not judge with their Kufr nor believe this, or took the issue by apparent form, until he knew himself about this subject.

Therefore, after he knew that, he said: "And Sīdī ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. ‘Āshir had not answered this question, 'What is your opinion on these people, because they dispose of Muslim wealth, prevented them from salary, cut off buying and selling from people and appropriated it for themselves, and befriended the Christians', until he saw with his own eye, when he came to Salé of Andalusia, them carrying food to the disbelievers and informing them of the Muslims' inadvertence. So he gave a fatwa for the permissibility of fighting them. He fought them and ruled the sword on their necks for days, until he extinguished their innovation and united the word by them."

So the scholar sometimes reads in books and does not look at the issue from the realistic aspect, so he imagines a conception as these people imagine in the story of Our Master Ḥāṭib. They consider spies and those who ally to be the same image, as if they are Ḥāṭib for example, *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu*, and far be it from him, and there is a huge difference between the two. But the man here, when he knew what they were doing from the practical aspect, gave a fatwa to fight them until he extinguished their innovation and united the word by them.

Ismā‘īl Ḥaqqī said in *Rūḥ al-Bayān*: "In the story of Ḥāṭib is an indication of the permissibility of tearing the veil of spies, and tearing the secrets of corrupters if there is an interest in it, or harm in covering it. And that whoever undertakes a prohibited matter then claims a probable

interpretation for it, it is accepted from him, for the excuse is accepted among noble people." He means that Ḥāṭib, when he spoke and showed [his excuse], the Messenger accepted his interpretation after that and considered it a preventer of his Kufr at that time. But he says it is permissible to tear the veil of spies and tear the secrets of corrupters if there is an interest.

This is the ruling on the spy according to jurists. Some of them view the old image (image of Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*) so they apply to these people that their action is a major sin, but they are made an example of, or their affair is chosen by the Imam, and it is permissible to kill them also by way of policy and not Apostasy. But those who say they are Apostates say this is *Muwālāh* and they took the disbelievers as allies and strove in the land causing corruption, so they have apostatized. This is speech as we recounted to you from the practical aspect.

And their speech is the Chosen Opinion (*Al-Ra'y al-Mukhtār*) according to me; because this is what agrees with our contemporary reality. Because the disbelievers in these days of ours... Espionage is a state. We saw and were burned by their fire. How many good people were killed, kidnapped, and imprisoned? Practically, most people in "Guantanamo" now, who took them? They took them for a few Dirhams in the year 2001 from treacherous spies, from Muslims, meaning what is called "The Muslim Spy," from the people of Islam. People ascribed to Islam are the ones who handed them over, informed on them, and presented them! And there is one who comes to a mosque or elsewhere and knows there is a specific personality and puts a chip in the mosque (electronic chip) or marks with some chalk or a specific phosphorescent thing or otherwise, and the missile comes and destroys persons, innocents, elders, and children. How many innocents were killed! Thousands, hundreds, more than two hundred thousand in Afghanistan alone! Aside from Iraq, Palestine, and others, and leaders being killed. All this is always from spies!

The problem of Muslims is in the **Internal Enemy**. The problem of Muslims is in these eyes that must be gouged out. So the image is not now like the image of the spy who used to write a letter. The spy now is an employee committing a continuous crime; this is a supporter among the supporters of Ṭāghūts. How do you say about one who takes a salary and daily spies on monotheists and spies on the slaves of Allāh and works with the disbelievers, indeed fights with them, and is a guide for them, and has a salary! This spy's ruling differs from the old spies. This spy is an **Apostate**, and prefers the worldly life.

They say perhaps he has a worldly purpose, because those who said the spy is not judged with Kufr or the one who allies with disbelievers is not judged with Kufr [say] because there is a worldly purpose! No, we said this worldly purpose is not a preventer among preventers of Takfīr. Otherwise, if worldly purpose were a preventer, Allāh said about the disbelievers: "They prefer the worldly life over the Hereafter" [QS. Ibrāhīm: 3]. Then no one on the face of the earth would disbelieve; all disbelievers prefer the worldly life over the Hereafter, so this is a worldly benefit. And Allāh says: "Never will your relatives or your children benefit you." Your wealth will not benefit you nor avail you anything. Thus all these moneys and relatives are not an excuse nor a preventer among preventers of Takfīr.

So these institutions, agencies, the state, and all these modern institutions and these armies rely very heavily on these spies. They are the ones occupying Muslim lands through these people, and penetrating the internal front via spies and via their supporters. This spy is not necessarily one working in hidden things. This spy might be a journalist, might be a lawyer, might be a judge, might be a media figure. Because the spy does not necessarily have to work in secret or wear dark glasses and wear what is called this "coat" and hold the "newspaper" and so on, that this is the spy! Or work the Arsène Lupin system. No, the spy might appear before you as a certain personality, a personality with status in society, yet he is among the people most serving the disbelievers, and he is the one who volunteers in harming Muslims.

Those whom Chirac consulted long ago and Sarkozy in France, they consulted those ascribed to Islam regarding banning the Hijab. He consulted Mohammed Arkoun, and they were the ones advising him on banning the Hijab and distorting Islam. And in London and Britain the same issue; a group of those ascribed to Islam are the ones advising them with these consultations: banning the Hijab, banning the Niqab, distorting Islam, that Islam is not suitable for every time and place. These are consultants and their state is considered as if lighter than the spy who places a chip here and there, but everyone has a role and to all of them applies: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them." This verse did not stipulate a specific condition nor stipulate Heartfelt Alliance. *Muwālāh* in itself like this is Kufr.

It is not stipulated that we say with the condition of Heartfelt *Muwālāh*. Meaning one loves Islam in his heart but allies with disbelievers apparently; we say to him it does not work, he is a disbeliever in this state, and we have nothing to do with his heart here. The condition is that *Muwālāh* in itself is causing Takfīr in itself.

Thus, this is the summary of the subject of the Ruling on the Spy in Islam, or the Muslim Spy.

There remains an issue as well. Perhaps some people say: The spy might be **Coerced (*Mukrah*)**. They might have done something to him, or made him drink something, or deceived him.

One of these old Palestinian spies, the Mossad came and captured him and detained him, and did to him what is called, and this is not from the Muslims, he is a person ascribed to Islam falsely like this, from the Marxists and irreligious at that time, they photographed him in a certain position with a woman, and did personal things to him and stripped him completely and so on, then brought the photos to him to make him submit to them or they publish them and expose him. He said to them: "By Allāh, I am very happy. Would that you print several copies for me so I can distribute them!" As for the rest, they used to collapse because they either fear their father or the family, so they become shy and weaken before them. So this story of Coercion we speak about has conditions, controls, and limits. This is what we will speak about, *In shā' Allāh*.

What is **Coercion (*Ikrāh*)**? What is the definition of Coercion? What is the limit of Coercion? We will summarize quickly.

We said that Coercion is a preventer among the preventers of Takfīr. If someone was subjected to Coercion, this is a preventer of his Takfīr. But what is its definition? There are many definitions in defining Coercion. The simplest and most concise definition is the definition of Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī when he said: "**Coercion is compelling another to do what he does not want.**" Naturally he placed several conditions, about five or four conditions. He said among the conditions of considering Coercion:

- **First:** That the doer (coercer) is **Able** to inflict what he threatens, and the commanded (victim) is **Incapable** of repelling even by fleeing. Someone able to hold you while you are incapable (Condition of Ability in the Doer, i.e., the Coercer who will coerce you) and you are incapable regarding him.
- **Second:** That it **Predominates on his thought** that if he refuses, he will inflict that upon him. It predominates on the thought of the coerced that they will execute the action on him.
- **Third:** That what he threatened him with is **Immediate (*Fawrī*)**. If the coercer threatened you saying: "If you do not do such-and-such, I will beat you tomorrow," he is not considered coerced because he says to you "tomorrow" and not "now." However, scholars excepted from this if he mentioned, for example, a very close time or after an

hour, or the custom ran that if he said to you "I will beat you" or "I will kill you" that he does it. In this case we consider it valid. For example, a ruler or minister or person with authority or power said to you: "If you do not do such-and-such tomorrow, I will kill you." Here we know that mostly this one kills and this one is able and it is famous about him and repeated from him. In this case, we consider it a condition among conditions of Valid Coercion.

- **Fourth:** That nothing appears from the commanded indicating his **Choice**; meaning there is nothing indicating that you are agreeing.

How do we know if this is choosing or not choosing? How do we set a limit for Coercion?

Scholars differed on the limit of Coercion, differed regarding what is threatened. As Ibn Ḥajar says: "They agreed on killing, destroying a limb, severe beating, and long imprisonment. But they differed on slight beating and imprisonment like a day or two or the like." And they differed also on the limit of Coercion as narrated from Umar *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu*: "A man is not safe regarding himself if he is imprisoned, bound, or tortured." And Judge Shurayḥ says: "Imprisonment, beating, threat, and binding are Coercion (*Kurh*)."

But the Ḥanafīs have a division; they divided Coercion into two parts: **Compelling Coercion (*Mulji’*)** and **Non-Compelling Coercion (*Ghayr Mulji’*)**:

- **Compelling Coercion:** Meaning complete coercion, paralyzing your movement completely. That is by threat of killing, cutting [limbs], and severe beating from which damage to life or limb is feared. This is Compelling Coercion, which compels you to inability.
- **Non-Compelling Coercion:** Meaning deficient (*Nāqiṣ*). It is what is by imprisonment, binding, and beating from which damage is not feared. Meaning he might be beaten and nothing happens to him, or they imprison him, or bind him, meaning damage does not usually happen to him. They consider this Deficient Coercion, Non-Compelling Coercion.

The school of the majority of scholars says that **Licensing (*Tarakhkhuṣ*) in Kufr is only by Compelling Coercion (Complete Compelling Coercion)**. This is the saying of the Ḥanafīs, Mālikīs, and Ḥanbalīs. But Imām Al-Shāfi‘ī has another opinion; Imām Al-Shāfi‘ī says: "Imprisonment and binding are Coercion to Apostasy." He disagrees with the majority on the issue that mere imprisonment and binding, meaning

placing shackles and chains, is Coercion to Apostasy; this is sufficient for him. This is famous in the books, you will find it in *Badā'i' al-Ṣanā'i'*, *Al-Sharḥ al-Ṣaghīr*, *Al-Mughnī* by Ibn Qudāmah, *Al-Sharḥ al-Kabīr*, and in *Al-Majmū'*. All books of the schools, you will find all this detailed in them.

However, if someone was coerced to Kufr, and they said to him "Disbelieve in Allāh; insult our Lord, insult the Prophet, do anything," and he chose killing over insulting... because he has a license (*Rukhṣah*), it is permissible for him to use the license and respond to them. But which is better? Taking the license and surviving, or being patient and being killed? Scholars agreed that whoever is coerced to Kufr and chooses killing, he is greater in reward with Allāh than who chose the license. This speech was quoted by Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī in *Al-Fatḥ*.

But when we see the opinions of scholars and their sayings, we notice that Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah preferred the saying of the majority, which is the saying of the Ḥanbalīs also: "That Coercion differs according to the difference of what is coerced upon. The coercion considered, for example, regarding the Word of Kufr is not like the coercion considered regarding Gift (*Hibah*) and the like", these simple things, one gifts someone money or a piece of land etc. Coercion here differs from coercion in Kufr, so we must distinguish between them, "For Aḥmad has stated in more than one place that Coercion to Kufr is only by torture via beating and binding, and speech is not Coercion." Meaning Imām Aḥmad does not consider speech Coercion. Someone says to you "I will beat you, I will torture you, I will do to you," he considers that not Coercion. But we said naturally there is a restriction if this person is known that he will beat, kill, and torture and it is known about him, such as being a possessor of authority or otherwise.

And Ibn Taymiyyah preferred the saying of the majority because he says: It is the reason for the revelation of the verse of Sūrah Al-Naḥl. For 'Ammār b. Yāsir *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* did not speak Kufr until the polytheists tortured him. According to the famous opinion, this is the reason for the revelation of His saying, Exalted is He:

مَن كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِن بَعْدِ إِيمَانِهِ إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ

"Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief... except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith." [QS. Al-Naḥl: 106]

So no one is licensed in Kufr except one who was coerced. As for anything else, he is not licensed in Kufr at all. It is permissible to take license in Kufr in this case by pronouncing Kufr in one case, which is the case of Coercion. And as in the Ḥadīth of 'Ammār b. Yāsir, *raḍiyallāhu*

‘anhu and his father and mother: "The polytheists took ‘Ammār and tortured him until he agreed with them in some of what they wanted. So he complained of that to the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. He said to him: 'How do you find your heart?' He said: 'Secure in Faith.' He said: 'Then if they return, return [to saying it].'" This Ḥadīth is Mursal but some authenticated it. And Imām Al-Bukhārī pointed in allusion to the limit of Coercion licensed in Kufr in the chapter "Whoever chose beating, killing, and humiliation over Kufr." Meaning Imām Al-Bukhārī views that a human has a single case where he can take license and speak the word of Kufr, which is Coercion by beating or torture and so on. He relied on the saying of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* in a Ḥadīth: "Three, whoever has them finds the sweetness of Faith," among them: "And that he hates to return to Kufr as he hates to be thrown into the Fire." "In it is an indication that returning to Kufr equals entering the Fire, meaning destruction. So license in Kufr is not given except upon fear of destruction and loss of life. This is the saying of the Majority."

So this is regarding the subject of the definition of Coercion and the limit of Coercion, and when license is taken in this word. Whoever says "I am afraid for the salary I take," "They made me drink something yellow" whether you drank something yellow, got drunk, they tortured you, photographed you, or raped you even; do you disbelieve in Allāh and harm Allāh's creation?!

There is a point also scholars pointed to: That even if **Valid Coercion** existed for a person and they said to him: "Kill this one or we kill you", meaning they put a gun to his head and said to him, "Kill this Muslim or we kill you, kill your Muslim brother." So he says "I will kill him so I am not killed!" We say: No. Scholars say: Even if Valid Coercion existed, it does not license them to kill Muslims and fight them.

Therefore Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī says in *Jāmi‘ al-‘Ulūm wa al-Ḥikam*: "Scholars agreed that if he was coerced to kill a protected person (*Ma‘ṣūm*), it is not valid for him to kill him. For he only kills him by his choice to ransom himself from killing. This is a consensus from the considered scholars." This consensus was quoted by Imām Al-Qurṭubī as well.

So even if we considered this human coerced, it is not permissible for him to kill a Muslim. This is as in the famous "American Fatwa" from a reality perspective, when a group of Sheikhs gave a fatwa that it is permissible for the American Muslim, in order to preserve the "Green Card" and to prove his loyalty to the Americans and the American government, to participate in fighting Muslims in Afghanistan! Even some

Sheikhs when asked about this person who will fight the Muslim Afghan people now, if both are killed what is their ruling? He did not tell them, for example, "This killer is the criminal, and this is the one exiting Shari'ah." No! He said: "Their affair is up to Allāh." *A'ūdhu billāh*! Meaning this one came with a Crusader army to kill Muslims, then fought and both were killed, and you tell me this innocent one whom we consider a martyr defending his religion, land, and honor... you tell me "Their affair is up to Allāh"?! And [you say] this one has justification and a preventer from Kufr, this one who entered to kill Muslims there and took the Crusader armies as allies! Just so he doesn't violate the concept of Citizenship and so people don't look at Muslims there with an eye of disdain! We seek refuge in Allāh! Is this a preventer?!

This is not an excuse nor anything. We are speaking about Valid Coercion, meaning they will kill you and the gun is at your head saying "Kill this one." But you now killed him by choice, you went with them by choice. So "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them." You are of them and you allied with them and killed protected souls. Your life is not dearer than the life of this Muslim to be preserved.

"Because if Valid Coercion existed, it does not prevent killing them and fighting them as well." Meaning suppose one is coerced in an army, so he is present with a group of disbelievers, he is coerced but we do not know him, do we prevent fighting him because he is coerced? No, he is resurrected according to his intention. So they are fought and killed, and their affair is up to Allāh.

Therefore Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah said: "Whoever they brought out with them coerced, he is resurrected according to his intention. And we must fight the army entirely, since the coerced cannot be distinguished from the non-coerced. It has been proven in a Ḥadīth in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* from the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* that he said: 'An army of people will raid this House. While they are in a desert of the land, they will be swallowed up. It was said: O Messenger of Allāh, indeed among them is the coerced. He said: They will be resurrected according to their intentions.'" And many Ḥadīths from the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* regarding this coerced one. Meaning an army containing coerced and non-coerced; do we stop because there is a coerced one who might be Muslim? No, they are fought and resurrected according to their intentions.

Therefore we notice an issue with Imām Al-Qurṭubī *raḥimahullāh* when he spoke about the saying of Allāh the Exalted in Sūrah Al-Naḥl:

"Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief... except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith. But those who [willingly] open their breasts to disbelief, upon them is wrath from Allah, and for them is a great punishment" [QS. Al-Naḥl: 106]. He said: "Scholars agreed that whoever was coerced to kill another, it is not permissible for him to proceed to kill him, nor violate his sanctity by flogging or otherwise. He should be patient on the affliction that befell him, and it is not lawful for him to ransom himself with another."

There is a problem now some people raise: Is Coercion in Speech or in Action?

Meaning someone told him "Disbelieve verbally", because with our Master ‘Ammār it was by speech; they said to him: "Disbelieve in such-and-such, insult Muḥammad, insult such-and-such." But in Action, if they said for example to a man "Prostrate to an idol," or said to him: "Prostrate to anything," or do any Kufr action. Are Action and Speech equal in Coercion?

They said: "If the coerced pronounces Kufr, it is not permissible for him to run it on his tongue except by way of Double Entendre (*Ma‘ārīḍ*). For in Double Entendre is ample space from lying. When it is not so, he is a disbeliever, because Double Entendre is not subject to the authority of Coercion. Example: If it is said to him 'Disbelieve in Allāh (*Allāh*)' he says 'In the *Lāhī* (the player/amusement).' And if it is said to him 'Disbelieve in the Prophet (*Al-Nabī*)' he says 'He is a disbeliever in the *Nabī* (the high place).'" This speech was brought by Al-Qurṭubī and he refuted it in the end. But he said scholars agreed that whoever is coerced to Kufr and chooses killing is greater in reward with Allāh than who chooses the license.

Also regarding Coercion by Action and Coercion by Speech, they said: In both cases they are equal. Meaning someone told him: "Prostrate to an idol or we kill you." This one who prostrates by action and was coerced, license is given to him like the one who spoke. Meaning: Coercion is in Action and Speech. As for this division, it is a division without any evidence; that they say to him "Coercion is in Speech," that you insult or say a specific saying. Even if you declared it, because he says to you: "Rather say Double Entendre!" My brother, he is going to be killed! How can he use Double Entendre? They tell him "Say this utterance in explicit text." Even if he said it in explicit text as he, *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, said to ‘Ammār: "If they return, return." "But those who [willingly] open their breasts to disbelief"; meaning even if he was not coerced and no one

threatened him but his breast opened to Kufr, he disbelieves without anything. His breast is open to Kufr.

But one is tortured and his breast is secure with Faith, even if he said with his tongue or did with his body or prostrated or did a Kufr action, in this case also license is given to him in that and he is not declared a disbeliever. Meaning Coercion is a preventer of his Takfīr here in Speech and Action, in Saying Kufr and Doing Kufr.

Because I know some youth focus on "It is only speech" ("If they return, return"), so this is speech. This is an example that he spoke. It does not mean that if he did [an action] he would not enter into the preventer. Because the point here is that he will be killed; there is loss of his life or he fears damage to a limb of his limbs or he is tortured severely. So to ransom himself he does this action. But if he is patient and refuses to respond to them and bears torture or killing, then naturally he is greater in reward than the one who took the license. But the one who takes the license is not blamed. Therefore ʻAmmār *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhu* people did not blame him and the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* said to him: "If they return, return." Naturally this subject is big and long, and I believe we dwelt well upon this subject (Issue of Coercion) and it is among the Sharʻī preventers. This preventer you apply to those who ally with disbelievers. It is not required that everyone who allies with disbelievers is considered a spy. The spy has a special term working in a specific way. But sometimes we say about these people "spies" by way of general generalization, meaning intending to make them ugly. But as a term, it is a type of *Muwālāh*, and turning to disbelievers, and it is backing (*Muẓāharah*) as well, and it is the essence of causing corruption against Muslims. So it is a type of *Tawallī*. Otherwise, there are those who did not work in reality with disbelievers as a spy but harms Muslims and turns to disbelievers, turns to them in their methodology, allies with them and beautifies their schools of thought. Indeed on the contrary, he wishes that they invade Muslim lands and spread their methodologies. This is turning (*Tawallī*) to these disbelievers; they love for them to appear over Muslims and for their laws to be apparent. This is a type of *Muwālāh* as well.

We have finished now the Ruling on the Spy and the difference of scholars regarding him. We saw that the Chosen Opinion regarding him which applies to our contemporary reality is that this spy is the Messenger of Evil, and the Eye of Disbelievers which must be gouged out, and that his ruling is **Apostate**. Even if there was disagreement from scholars of old in this issue due to their conception of the issue of Ḥāṭib *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhu*, but the reality is that the spy in our days is more dangerous than what was before. Therefore his ruling is that he is an Apostate, and that he is killed

in any case. And if there is an Imam and he came repenting of his own accord and confessed, then the Imam has a choice in this case: either to kill him, even if he accepts his Islam, but he is killed for the punishment of Espionage in itself, and for the punishment of damages he caused. But it might be accepted from the aspect of religion (*Diyānah*) that he returned to Islam and sought forgiveness. But regarding rights and other punishment, the Imam sees the interest in this, if he came repenting and his state became clear and it became clear that he repented a sincere repentance.

So this spying for disbelievers against Muslims enters essentially into allying with them, as in the beginning of Sūrah Al-Mumtaḥanah as we spoke before. Backing disbelievers and aiding them against Muslims by any type of types is Major Kufr expelling from the Millah by agreement of scholars. We told you scholars differed on the Takfīr of the Spy ascribed to Islam due to the old image that Our Master Ḥāṭib did an action which was not Kufr in their view and he only committed a major sin. But we told you in this case (Case of Our Master Ḥāṭib) that he did a Kufr action causing Takfīr, but he did not disbelieve because he erred in Interpretation, and Interpretation is a preventer among preventers of Takfīr.

I suffice with this amount. *In shā' Allāh*, in the next eighth lesson, we try to differentiate between *Taqiyyah*, Coercion, and *Mudārah* and some other issues. And we try to summarize as much as possible until we finish this course.

I say this statement of mine and ask Allāh for forgiveness for me and for you.

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Eighth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We praise Him for all good; we thank Him and are not ungrateful to Him. We cast off and forsake those who disobey Him. O Allāh, You alone we worship, to You we pray and prostrate, and towards You we strive and hasten. We hope for Your mercy and fear Your punishment; surely, Your serious punishment will overtake the disbelievers. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

To proceed:

Honored brothers listening to us, this is the eighth lecture among the lectures on *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. Today, *In shā' Allāh*, we will speak about the concept of **Taqiyyah** (Precaution/Dissimulation), its definition, the sayings of the scholars regarding its rulings and controls, and we will also speak about the difference between *Taqiyyah* and **Coercion (*Ikrāh*)**.

At the beginning, I say to you that *Taqiyyah* has a relationship to the concept of *Muwālāh* (Alliance). Some say it is a form of *Muwālāh* or it is *Muwālāh*, and it also has a relationship to the concept of Coercion because you go along with these people and ally with them in words and deeds out of fear and caution of them. Some sometimes liken it and reach the point that it *is* Coercion, or that it is related to the verse [Sūrah Al-Naḥl: 106] "Except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith." So lest anyone think we are speaking about fragmented, severed issues having no relation to the subject; no, rather it has a relation, rulings, and forms. Scholars spoke about this issue strongly, and the subject of *Taqiyyah* is a large subject and not that easy. Therefore we try, *In shā' Allāh*, to speak on the subject of the concept of *Taqiyyah* and its rulings.

First, we begin with the saying of Allāh the Exalted:

لَّا يَتَّخِذِ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِن دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ۖ وَمَن يَفْعَلْ ذَٰلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِي شَيْءٍ إِلَّا أَن تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً ۗ وَيُحَذِّرُكُمُ اللَّهُ نَفْسَهُ ۗ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ الْمَصِيرُ

"Let not believers take disbelievers as allies rather than believers. And whoever [of you] does that has nothing with Allah, except when taking precaution against them in prudence. And Allah warns you of Himself, and to Allah is the [final] destination." [QS. Āl ʻImrān: 28]

This is the verse from which scholars launched and spoke on the subject of *Taqiyyah*, the rulings of *Taqiyyah*, and the controls of *Taqiyyah* over centuries until our present time.

What is the meaning of *Taqiyyah* from the linguistic aspect? If you open any dictionary in the Arabic language, especially large dictionaries like *Lisān al-‘Arab* by Ibn Manẓūr, or *Tāj al-‘Arūs* by Al-Zabīdī and others, these dictionaries say, as in *Lisān al-‘Arab* for example: "**Taqiyyah**, its origin in the language is **Caution (*Ḥadhar*)**." What is the relationship of *Muwālāh* to *Taqiyyah*? Caution is one thing and *Muwālāh* means Proximity, Nearness, and Support. So the verbal noun (*Maṣdar*) is *Taqiyyah*. Therefore, it appeared in some recitations, the recitation we read, "Except when taking precaution against them in prudence (*tuqātan*)," and in some other recitations: "Except when taking precaution against them in precaution (*taqiyyatan*)."

We say *attaqīhi*: I avoid him, I am cautious of him. So its origin is also from Caution. We notice scholars spoke on this issue and there are many things in the language; I will not burden you much with this subject. But we say for example what Abū Ḥayyān mentioned in *Al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ* when he says in the interpretation of this verse "Let not believers take disbelievers as allies rather than believers." He says: "It was revealed regarding the Companion ‘Ubādah b. al-Ṣāmit; he had allies from the Jews and wanted to seek support through them against the enemy. It was said [it was revealed] regarding ‘Abd Allāh b. Ubayy and his companions who used to ally with the Jews. It was said regarding a group of Jews." We will not concern ourselves much with this subject. The important thing is the verse; this verse was revealed regarding a people who were showing affection to the disbelievers of Quraysh, so the verse was revealed regarding them. "So the meaning of taking them as allies means being gentle with them in social interaction, due to kinship or friendship, this was before Islam, or a previous favor or otherwise. This, as it appears, is what they were forbidden from," as Abū Ḥayyān says.

"As for taking that with his heart and intention, a believer does not do that. Those forbidden here, Faith has been established for them, meaning Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* established that they are believers. So the prohibition here means prohibition from being gentle with them and inclining toward them. And gentleness is general in all ages. This has been repeated in the Quran", meaning this is a prohibition not specific to the days of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and the days of the Companions; this is until the Hour is established. "Suffice for you from that His saying, Exalted is He: 'You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His

Messenger.' Loving for Allāh and Hating for Allāh is a great principle among the principles of religion."

Some people say "Let not believers take" (*Lā yattakhidhi al-mu'minūna*). "*Lā*" here is prohibitive (*Nāhiyah*), it is a prohibition against taking them; this is unlawfulness (*Taḥrīm*). But in another recitation: "*Lā yattakhidhu al-mu'minūna*"; here it is negation (*Nafy*) not prohibition. They said the first, the recitation we read, "Let not believers take" (*Lā yattakhidhi*) is with most reciters. "*Yattakhidh*" here is in the Jussive mood (*Majzūm*) by "*Lā*," but due to the meeting of two unvoweled letters (*Sākinān*), we broke [added kasrah to] the *Dhāl*, because after the *Dhāl* is *Alif*, and the *Alif* is *Sākin* and the *Dhāl* is *Sākin*. In the language, if two *Sākins* meet, we break the first. So we broke "*yattakhidhi*." Thus, *Lā* is prohibitive, so it is *Majzūm*. But "*Lā* of Negation (*Nāfiyah*)" according to the other recitation: "*Lā yattakhidhu*," meaning negation. But they said this is negation with the meaning of prohibition; the intent by it is prohibition as Abū Ḥayyān said, and Al-Kisā'ī permitted it, and Al-Kisā'ī said in his recitation also that the Nominative case (*Raf'*) is permissible here.

"So the suitability of this verse to what preceded it of verses in Sūrah Āl 'Imrān is what the believer must be upon of glorifying Allāh and praising Him with actions specific to Him, and mentioning what the believer must be upon regarding dealing with creation. However, the apparent meaning of the verse 'Let not believers take disbelievers as allies rather than believers. And whoever [of you] does that has nothing with Allah, except when taking precaution against them in prudence. And Allah warns you of Himself, and to Allah is the [final] destination' is the prohibition of allying with them, except what was allowed for us therein of taking them as slaves, and seeking help from them, the help seeking of the mighty from the humiliated, and the higher from the lower, and marriage among them," because marriage from the People of the Book is permissible.

This is a form of *Muwālāh* but is not *Muwālāh* in reality as I told you before. They are forms similar to *Muwālāh*, but it is not of the blameworthy *Muwālāh* here in this case because it is permitted for us in the Shari'ah, even if its form is *Muwālāh*, meaning one who marries a Christian woman or a Jewish woman. "So all this is a type of *Muwālāh* permitted for us, and we are not forbidden from it, so the prohibition is not on its generality." Meaning there are cases like selling with Jews and Christians, or trading with them, or dealing with them, working for them, and like one who has disbelieving parents; this is a type of good treatment, and there is no prohibition in it nor anything, because this is permitted for us in Shari'ah.

But there is an exception, which is "except when taking precaution against them in prudence." This is an exception, as scholars say: "One does not take a disbeliever as an ally for anything of things except for the reason of *Taqiyyah*." Meaning if it is necessary, it should only be for *Taqiyyah*. Meaning it is permissible to show *Muwālāh* by utterance and action without the heart and conscience being set upon it. One might go along with them in utterance and action but his heart is not set on allying with them and not pleased with this.

Therefore Ibn ‘Abbās said: "The *Taqiyyah* referred to is apparent diplomacy (*Mudārah*)", and we will speak about the concept of *Mudārah* later, "and it is with the disbelievers or while among them, so he treats them with precaution (*yattaqīhim*) with his tongue while he has no affection for them in his heart." And Qatādah said: "If the disbelievers are dominant or the believers are among a disbelieving people and fear them, they may ally with them and treat them with diplomacy (*yudārūhum*) to repel evil, while their heart is secure in Faith." And Ibn Mas‘ūd *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* said: "Mix with people and separate from them (*zāyilūhum* - inwardly/in action), and deal with them with what they desire, but your religion, do not surrender it." Meaning as for the religion, no; beware regarding your religion lest you concede it, but only by way of diplomacy and by way of gentleness in speech and so on.

There is a narration from Mu‘ādh b. Jabal *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* that he said: "*Taqiyyah* was in the newness (*jiddah*) of Islam —meaning in the beginning of Islam— before the strengthening of the religion and the power of Muslims. As for today, Allāh has honored the Muslims so that they do not fear them (*yattaqūhum*) by fearing their enemy." He says *Taqiyyah* was in the beginning of Islam in the stage of weakness, and now Allāh has honored the Muslims.

But Al-Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī and other scholars said: No, *Taqiyyah* is permissible until the Day of Resurrection, but we must pay attention, and **There is no *Taqiyyah* in Killing**. *Taqiyyah* is permissible but there is no *Taqiyyah* in killing, because some scholars actually confuse this issue. Meaning someone says to you "Kill this man or I will kill you." There is no *Taqiyyah* here. Do not say "I am afraid of him, he will kill me." If you killed him, you are killed for him and there is no excuse for you in this. As we said in the past lecture about Coercion, we said there is no Coercion in Killing. So it is not permissible for you to use this as an excuse and it is not permitted for you, and you are executed (*tuqādu bihi*) if you kill him.

Al-Zamakhsharī said in the interpretation of "except when taking precaution against them in prudence": "Except that you fear from their side a matter that must be guarded against (*yuttaqā*)."

And Abū Ḥayyān said: "The apparent meaning of the verse implies the permissibility of allying with them when fearing them. As for *Muwālāh* with the heart, there is no disagreement among Muslims regarding its prohibition. Likewise *Muwālāh* by speech and action without *Taqiyyah*." Because some scholars say *Taqiyyah* is by speech only and not by action. No, the correct opinion in this issue is that *Taqiyyah* is by speech and action, but with the controls scholars spoke about.

Some people say regarding the subject (Is *Taqiyyah* in sayings or actions?), we told you some Imams used to say: *Taqiyyah* is in sayings only, meaning *Taqiyyah* is in sayings not actions. And some say: This is attributed to some Companions. But the companions of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah said: "*Taqiyyah* is a license from Allāh the Exalted, and abandoning it is better. If he was coerced to Kufr and did not do it until he was killed, he is better than one who showed it, meaning showed *Muwālāh*. Likewise every matter in which there is honoring of the religion; proceeding upon it until he is killed is better than taking the license." This is speech of gold. They were refuting some scholars who said: The one who showed it and avoided killing is better. They refuted them and said: No, the one who was killed is better than the one who took the license.

Imām Aḥmad has beautiful words on the subject of the Trial of the Creation of the Quran, when they said to him: Why did you not answer out of *Taqiyyah*? Or use Double Entendre as some scholars did. But he said: "**If the scholar answers out of *Taqiyyah* and the ignorant is ignorant, then when will the truth become clear?!**"

And Imām Aḥmad said: "What has been transmitted to us, successor from predecessor, is that the Companions and their followers sacrificed themselves for the essence of Allāh, and that regarding Allāh, the blame of a blamer does not seize them, nor the tyranny of an oppressive tyrant."

Al-Rāzī said in *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*: "*Taqiyyah* is only permissible regarding what relates to showing the truth and religion. As for what returns harm necessarily to others, like killing, Zina, usurping wealth, false testimony, slandering chaste women, and informing disbelievers of the nakedness (*'awrāt*) of Muslims, then it is not permissible at all." Meaning he says *Taqiyyah* is permissible regarding what relates to showing truth and religion; one might be diplomatic in some Shar'ī things, soften speech for them, ally with them in a specific thing. But if he is asked to kill a human,

or commit Zina, or usurp wealth, or testify falsely, or slander chaste women, or inform disbelievers of the nakedness of Muslims, then it is not permissible at all. One says to you: "I will do it because they will revoke citizenship from me if I do not go with them, for example, to fight Muslims in Afghanistan or Iraq or Somalia or Mali or any place in the world. I now have British citizenship or American citizenship or French citizenship or otherwise, so if I do not go with them they will revoke citizenship from me or imprison me or otherwise." This is not permissible at all.

Because they use some Arabized Arabs, those of Muslim origins, and use them because they know the places and paths, and speak with the inhabitants so they inform them. This one informs the disbelievers of the nakedness of Muslims, and also participates with them in killing! And even if he does not participate with them in killing, he guides them to the nakedness of Muslims, and this is not permissible. He should not make an excuse saying: "They will revoke citizenship from me or imprison me"! All this is not considered at all.

"The apparent meaning of the verse indicates that it is with **Dominant Disbelievers**." The apparent meaning of the verse is that when disbelievers are dominant, you take precaution against them. Meaning you are afraid to show your religion because if you did, they might beat you or assault you, so you try as much as possible to be cautious of them and guard against them or go along with them in a specific thing, but with the conditions we stated.

Imām Al-Shāfi‘ī has an opinion and a school in that. He says: This is not only with dominant disbelievers. Imām Al-Shāfi‘ī has an opinion that might be a picture of the reality we live in. He says if the state between Muslims resembles the state between polytheists, meaning it happened that Muslims are mixed with polytheists in one place, he says: "*Taqiyyah* is permissible to protect the self (*Muḥāmah ‘an al-Nafs*) in this case, and it is permissible to preserve life and wealth," as Imām Al-Shāfi‘ī said.

Some scholars infer with this verse something else unrelated to the subject; this verse is evidence that a disbeliever has no guardianship (*Wilāyah*) over a Muslim in anything. We will not enter into details on this.

Imām Al-Ṭabarī in his Tafsīr speaks about this subject saying: "This is a prohibition from Allāh *‘Azza wa Jalla* to the believers against taking the disbelievers as helpers, supporters, and backs (*Ẓuhūr*). Therefore He broke [added kasrah to] '*Yattakhidh*', meaning because it is in the position of Jussive by Prohibition, and he means the meeting of two *Sākins* so we break the first. The meaning of that is: Do not take, O believers, the disbelievers as a back and supporters, allying with them in their religion

and backing them against the Muslims instead of the believers and guiding them to their nakedness. For whoever does that 'has nothing with Allah.' He means by that: He has become free of Allāh and Allāh has become free of him by his apostasy from his religion and his entry into Kufr. 'Except when taking precaution against them in prudence': Unless you are under their authority so you fear them for yourselves, so you show them *Wilāyah* (loyalty) with your tongues and conceal enmity for them, and do not support them in what they are upon of Kufr, and do not help them against a Muslim with an action." Notice the restrictions and conditions stipulated by Imām Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī.

Naturally, he relied in that on some Companions and Tābi'īn. He says in speech from Ibn 'Abbās: "Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* forbade the believers from being gentle with the disbelievers or taking them as intimates instead of the believers, unless the disbelievers are dominant over them." If the believers have dominance, it is not permissible; neither gentleness nor taking them as supporters and helpers and so on. "Unless the disbelievers are dominant over them, so they show them gentleness and oppose them in religion. That is His saying: 'Except when taking precaution against them in prudence'." Meaning Ibn Jarīr says that if the disbelievers are dominant, it is permissible in this case to take license by showing them gentleness in speech, but you oppose them in religion, and your heart conceals enmity for them. As for the one who shows loyalty to them in their religion and disavowal of the believers, this is not permissible and this is a polytheist (*Mushrik*). Meaning the one who allies with them in their religion and reveals to them the nakedness of the believers, even if they were dominant; whoever does this is a polytheist, Allāh has become free of him. Unless he takes precaution (*yattaqī tuqātan*), so he shows loyalty to them in the sense of gentleness in things and does not show enmity, because he cannot show enmity. This is the permitted case.

Ibn Jarīr says in the interpretation of "Except when taking precaution against them in prudence": "The most likely of the meanings of speech is 'Unless you fear from them a fear.' So the *Taqiyyah* mentioned by Allāh the Exalted in this verse is *Taqiyyah* from the disbelievers, not from others. Qatādah directed it to mean that its interpretation is: Unless you fear Allāh for the sake of the kinship between you and them, a fear." Meaning he says because some scholars say: "Unless you fear from them" means kinship. He says no, this verse speaks about disbelievers, *Taqiyyah* from dominant disbelievers, it does not speak about those who are Muslims.

Imām Al-Qurṭubī also followed the same path and quoted to us the saying of Al-Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī when he said: "*Taqiyyah* is permissible for a human until the Day of Resurrection, and there is no *Taqiyyah* in killing."

He also quoted from the Imam, from Al-Ḍaḥḥāk and others, saying: "It was said that the believer, if he is existing among disbelievers, has the right to treat them diplomatically with the tongue if he is fearful for himself while his heart is secure in Faith. And *Taqiyyah* is not lawful except with fear of killing, cutting [limbs], or great harm." Notice this is closer to Coercion as well. You notice the great similarity between it and Coercion. Therefore sometimes some scholars use the word "Except that you fear from them a fear" and it means Coercion in the same subject.

Sheikh Al-Alūsī has very extensive speech on this subject as well when he said: "Among people are those who inferred with this verse, meaning verse number 28 of Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān, that it is not permissible to make them workers nor employ them in matters of the Diwan (administration) and otherwise. Likewise, they included in the prohibited *Muwālāh*: greeting (*Salām*), honoring, and calling by Kunya (agnomen)." Meaning do not say to him "O Mister So-and-so," "O Sir So-and-so," or say to him "Al-salāmu ‘alaykum." But this is when believers are dominant. As for when disbelievers are dominant, it is licensed in this case to be gentle in expression but with the restrictions we speak about, such as fearing killing or cutting for himself. Some say fear for self or fear of harm is sufficient. But here he says: If he knows they will kill him or cut a limb of his limbs, then here it is as if we are speaking about the conditions of Coercion.

Imām Al-Alūsī in his Tafsīr in *Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī* mentioned very many things, and clarified the opinions of Islamic sects on this subject. The **Kharijites** do not accept *Taqiyyah*. The opinion of the Kharijites is almost that there is no *Taqiyyah*; he might die and not practice *Taqiyyah*. They never take licenses.

As for the **Shī‘ah**, the dominant opinion among them, for they do not have one opinion, but mostly they permit it. Some of them obligate *Taqiyyah*, indeed consider it religion and consider it a pillar among pillars for them. Some permit it in cases with specific conditions, and this is the old opinion among them. But the practiced and famous opinion is that *Taqiyyah* is obligatory and it is religion and there is no religion for one who has no *Taqiyyah*.

Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* detailed this subject, and scholars who refuted the Shī‘ah in detail on the subject of *Taqiyyah* for whoever wants to expand on the issue, especially *Taqiyyah* according to the Shī‘ah. But we are speaking about *Taqiyyah* because they rely on the same verse [Āl ‘Imrān Verse number 28]. It does not mean that because the Shī‘ah permit *Taqiyyah* or obligate it that we say there is no

Taqiyyah. No; *Taqiyyah* exists by the text of the Quran "Except when taking precaution against them in prudence." But the controls we have differ from the controls they have. They there might practice *Taqiyyah* even against believers and Muslims, evidence that they declare Muslims disbelievers fundamentally, declare Ahl al-Sunnah disbelievers, so they deal with *Taqiyyah* for this sake. They practice it as if *Taqiyyah* is the default, although the Quran considered it an exception.

So the Kharijites went to the view that *Taqiyyah* is not permissible in any case, and preservation of wealth, preservation of life, and honor are not observed in contrast to religion at all. They say it is not permissible; religion is the default, and life goes and wealth goes. Naturally, they are very strict in this chapter. As for the Shī'ah, their speech, as Al-Alūsī said, is in the utmost confusion. They are confused in this station, naturally because they are confused creeds containing deviation. Some of them said: "It is permissible in all sayings upon necessity, and perhaps obligatory in them for a type of kindness and seeking benefit (*Istiṣlāḥ*). It is not permissible in actions like killing a believer nor in what is known or thought predominantly to be corruption in religion. Al-Mufīd said, Al-Mufīd is a Sheikh among their Sheikhs: It might be obligatory sometimes, and doing it at a time might be better than leaving it, and leaving it might be better than doing it. Abū Ja'far Al-Ṭūsī said: The apparent meaning of narrations indicates it is obligatory upon fear for life. Others said: It is obligatory upon fear for wealth also and recommended for protecting honor." Very much speech they mentioned, but the famous opinion among them is that it is obligatory.

We summarize the issue for you as some scholars summarized it long ago. Al-Rāzī said in *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb* when he spoke about the subject of *Taqiyyah*, he said there are several issues. He spoke on the word *Taqiyyah* and its meaning and spoke on its source. He said: "Al-Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī said: Musaylimah the Liar took two men from the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*. He said to one of them: 'Do you testify that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh?' He said: 'Yes, yes, yes.' He said: 'Do you testify that I am the Messenger of Allāh?' He said: 'Yes.' Musaylimah used to claim he is the Messenger of Banū Ḥanīfah, and Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* is the Messenger of Quraysh. So he let him go and called the other. He said: 'Do you testify that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh?' He said: 'Yes.' He said: 'Do you testify that I am the Messenger of Allāh?' He said: 'I am deaf,' three times. So he brought him forward and killed him. That reached the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and he said: 'As for this killed one, he proceeded on his certainty and truthfulness, so congratulations to him. As

for the other, he accepted the license of Allāh, so there is no blame (*tabi‘ah*) upon him.'" Therefore they say: And the counterpart of this verse, the verse of Āl ‘Imrān, is "Except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith," i.e., the verse of Sūrah Al-Naḥl.

"Know that *Taqiyyah* has many rulings:

- **First:** *Taqiyyah* is only when a man is among a disbelieving people, and fears them for his life and wealth, so he treats them diplomatically with the tongue; that is by not showing enmity with the tongue. Rather it is also permissible to show speech implying affection and alliance, but with the condition that he conceals the opposite, and uses double entendres in all he says, meaning uses *Ma‘ārīḍ* as much as possible, for the effect of *Taqiyyah* is in the apparent, not in the states of the hearts. Naturally this is consensus; the heart must be secure in Faith. If one is tortured and his heart is secure in Kufr, he is a disbeliever whether they tortured him or did not torture him.
- **Second Ruling:** Even if he declared Faith and Truth where *Taqiyyah* is permissible for him, that would be better for him. Meaning he confronts them even if anything happens to him as in the story of Musaylimah.
- **Third Ruling:** It is only permissible regarding showing *Muwālāh* and *Mu‘ādāh*. It may also be permissible regarding showing religion as well. Notice all of them focus on the subject of showing religion only, but when they speak about rights of others. As for what returns its harm to others like killing, Zina, usurping wealth, false testimony, slandering chaste women, and informing disbelievers of the nakedness of Muslims, that is not permissible at all. And we have quoted this to you before.
- **Fourth Ruling:** The apparent meaning of the verse is that *Taqiyyah* is only lawful with dominant disbelievers. Except that the school of Al-Shāfi‘ī *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* is that if the state among Muslims resembles the state with disbelievers and polytheists, *Taqiyyah* becomes lawful to protect the self. As I told you, according to Imām Al-Shāfi‘ī, if there is participation with Muslims and they intermixed with each other, here it is permissible to protect the self, meaning if there is a threat to the Muslim in this case.
- **Fifth Ruling:** *Taqiyyah* is permissible to preserve life. Is it permissible to preserve wealth? Some said: Not permissible. Some said: Permissible. But he says: Yes, it is permissible due to the

> saying of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*: 'The sanctity of the wealth of a Muslim is like the sanctity of his blood,' and his saying: 'Whoever is killed defending his wealth is a martyr.' And because the need for wealth is intense. Therefore *Taqiyyah* is licensed for him to preserve wealth, for regarding life, all of them are agreed."

The last issue remains in *Taqiyyah*: Is *Taqiyyah* limited to a specific time? Meaning in the days of the time of Companions or upon the weakness of Muslims only in early Islam?

He said no, *Taqiyyah* is permissible until the Hour is established. This opinion is more appropriate, because repelling harm from the self is obligatory as much as possible.

Okay, we noticed now that there is a similarity, and that the use of *Taqiyyah* is sometimes like the subject of Coercion. Because *Taqiyyah* is that you are wary of them but ally with them by word or deed to avoid their evil, out of fear for yourself or your wealth or that they overcome you. Therefore you use *Taqiyyah* here. Coercion is the same matter; we spoke about it and said that the default in Apparent *Muwālāh* is that it is Kufr in itself, and it is not licensed except in the case of Coercion "Except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith." Meaning except one coerced by speech or action, as we told you in the correct sayings, except one coerced by speech or action.

And we said that among the conditions of Coercion: **Compelling Coercion (*Al-Ikrāh al-Mulji'*)**, meaning Complete Coercion, not Deficient Coercion; or Major Coercion versus Minor Coercion. Complete Compelling Coercion is that he threatens you either with killing or cutting a limb of your limbs or severe damaging beating. This is what is called Complete Compelling Coercion. As for Small Coercion or Deficient Coercion, it is imprisonment for a day or two or some simple things like this, beating or insult or rebuke. This is not considered, and a human is not licensed in it to say Kufr or do Kufr just so they don't imprison him for a month or two days, while there is no damage to limb nor killing nor anything.

Imām Al-Shāfi'ī has an opinion that binding in itself and imprisonment in itself is considered, but he disagrees with the majority in this subject.

Thus, **Apparent *Muwālāh* of disbelievers is Major Kufr**. Why? Due to His saying, Exalted is He: "And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them" as we spoke about before. And the

judgment of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* regarding Al-‘Abbās, the uncle of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* was that he took him by his apparent [state] among the captives of Badr. Although he said to him "I was a Muslim," he judged his apparent state as being among the disbelievers, and said: "Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* knows best your inner self." So he took him as a disbeliever and did not accept his proof that he was coerced or otherwise. Because he allied with them and went out with them in their ranks fighting with them, the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* did not consider this, and judged him as a disbeliever.

Kufr is not permissible to show, as we told you, except with Valid Coercion, not for mere fear or interest. Allāh did not license showing Kufr except with Coercion: "Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief... except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith." Meaning mere fear of disbelievers without the occurrence of Valid Coercion from them does not permit the Muslim to agree with them outwardly. Someone says to you: "If I do not do Kufr with them or participate in their armies or enter with them into the church and attend their prayer or wear their uniform or if I do not wear this cross, they will revoke citizenship from me! They will cut aid from me or any of these threats of theirs!" Mere expectation of fear or fear of such threats, all this has no consideration and is disregarded in declaring Kufr or doing Kufr or saying Kufr for the sake of mere fear or for the sake of some ordinary worldly fortunes you will be deprived of; that he revokes the Green Card from you or revokes citizenship from you. All this is not considered for saying Kufr. All this is not considered for declaring Kufr or doing Kufr.

Also when we told you that *Taqiyyah* in Shari'ah, its origin and meaning is Caution (*Ḥadhar*) of disbelievers, and its meaning in language is like this fundamentally. Meaning its origin is Caution upon fear of them due to their appearance and dominance. It is by concealing enmity for them or by diplomacy with them by showing gentle speech and good cohabitation to them. This is what is permissible to show with fear. Meaning maybe: "Hello, Hi," those living with him might greet them according to their language (bonsoir, bonjour, good morning), and you greet him or smile at him. Showing gentleness and good cohabitation is permissible for you to do if you are afraid of them and their enmity. But if he shows more than that, meaning he defends them, defends them and their Shari'ah and their law, and beautifies it, writes about it, composes poetry, and praises it, how can you tell me this one has *Taqiyyah* and this is a result of fear?! We said Necessity is estimated according to its extent.

You are only permitted to show gentle speech and good cohabitation to them. This is what is permissible to show with fear. But if

he shows more than that by defending disbelievers or supporting them or fighting with them, this is Apparent *Muwālāh* causing Takfīr in itself. Nothing of it is permissible except with Compelling Coercion.

Naturally, even with Compelling Coercion, if they said to you: "Kill the Muslims here" or "Kill these and strike with the plane now and press this button so you kill these Muslims in Iraq or Afghanistan or Somalia or any place," this is not permissible. This is *Muwālāh*. If he does that, he cannot argue by Coercion here. Your self is not dearer than these innocent selves being killed among the children of Muslims. Therefore the consensus is that Coercion does not permit killing a Muslim without right. This is the consensus of Muslims entirely, with all sects, denominations, and schools ascribed to Islam and the People of the Qiblah. You want to go kill a Muslim and say "I am coerced and they will kill me"?! No, you are killed and he is not killed.

Some scholars became lenient in the issue so Diplomacy (*Mudārah*) became *Taqiyyah*. The gentleness we speak about is closer to *Mudārah*; gentleness of cohabitation might be by way of *Mudārah*. As for *Taqiyyah* in the sense of this Apparent *Muwālāh* without fear and without any restrictions, this is Apparent *Muwālāh*. Meaning you deal with them and claim you are afraid. Afraid of what? You expect fear regarding nonexistent issues. Meaning you disbelieve in Allāh, insult the Quran, insult the Messenger, fight with them against Muslims, and guide to their nakedness, and tell me this is *Taqiyyah*!! This is Apparent *Muwālāh* and your saying that it is out of fear or something of this sort is not considered. Insulting and expressions containing explicit insulting or by winking and nodding or by anything or by action; this is what is licensed in one case which is Compelling Coercion: that you will be killed or a limb of your limbs will be amputated or destroyed, or torture you cannot bear. Here in this case "If they return, return" as in the Ḥadīth of ʻAmmār.

As for one who refused and persisted like what Our Master Bilāl did for example, he is better and his reward is greater with Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Taʻālā*. But the one who went along with them and allied with them by word or deed as a result of Coercion or result of this beating or fearing killing for himself or damage to a limb or otherwise or torture that is unbearable, in this case we do not blame him. He took license by the command of Shari'ah "Except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith," and in Āl ʻImrān: "Except when taking precaution against them in prudence."

Some scholars said: *Taqiyyah* is Apparent *Muwālāh*. Therefore you notice sometimes scholars of Tafsīr speak about *Taqiyyah* as Apparent

Muwālāh, which is not declared except in the case of Coercion. As for the *Taqiyyah* which is closer to *Mudārah*, that you treat them diplomatically and try to be gentle, this is the meaning of *Taqiyyah* [in that context], meaning good cohabitation and gentleness and so on. But you are not licensed to say Kufr in *Taqiyyah* with this concept which is closer to *Mudārah*.

Sometimes one has an imagined fear; that they will do a matter to me. Even if they did, what will they do?!

Revoke the Green Card from you for example?! Revoke the temporary residency from you?! So you declare Kufr, do Kufr, fight Muslims with them, beautify their school and religion, and tell me "So they don't revoke the residency from me"?!

No, let you and your residency go to Hell if you are going to do that! You are not licensed in that fundamentally.

Ibn Ḥajar has a good definition in *Al-Fatḥ*, he says: "**Taqiyyah is caution against showing what is in the soul of belief and otherwise to others.**" You are cautious and hide something of your belief, and this belief you fear others viewing. So *Taqiyyah* is merely caution, not *Muwālāh*, according to Ibn Ḥajar.

Therefore Ibn al-Qayyim *raḥimahullāh* in *Badā’i‘ al-Fawā’id* said: "It is known that *Tuqāh* (*Taqiyyah*) is not *Muwālāh*. But when Allāh forbade them from allying with disbelievers, that required showing enmity to them and disavowal of them and declaring hostility to them in every case, except if they feared their evil. So He permitted *Taqiyyah* for them, and *Taqiyyah* is not *Muwālāh*." Meaning Ibn al-Qayyim says *Taqiyyah* is something other than *Muwālāh*, because *Muwālāh* is forbidden fundamentally.

And Sheikh ‘Abd al-Laṭīf b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Āl al-Sheikh said: "The issue of showing enmity is different from the issue of the existence of enmity. The first is excused with fear and inability due to His saying, Exalted is He: 'Except when taking precaution against them in prudence.' The second is indispensable because it enters into Kufr in Taghut, and between it and love for Allāh and His Messenger is a total correlation inseparable from the believer."

The Sheikh means that the existence of enmity towards disbelievers in the heart of the believer and showing this enmity to disbelievers are two obligations. The first obligation is the existence of enmity; it is indispensable in every case. As for the other, showing enmity, it is permissible to abandon it upon fear. Meaning I have two in my chest; one

is the obligation of enmity, and the second: showing enmity. But I cannot show enmity due to fear. In this case, it is permissible to leave this showing upon fearing them. Thus it is known by that that *Taqiyyah* according to Sheikh ʻAbd al-Laṭīf, and this is in the book *Al-Rasā'il al-Muſīdah*, only permits **hiding the enmity towards disbelievers**. I believe it is the same speech as Ibn al-Qayyim, and it returns to Ibn Ḥajar's definition that *Taqiyyah* is caution against showing what is in the soul, which means enmity towards disbelievers. So *Taqiyyah* is hiding enmity towards disbelievers.

Al-Qurṭubī says regarding the meaning of *Taqiyyah*: "It is that he speaks with his tongue while his heart is secure in Faith." He quoted this speech from Ibn ʻAbbās. And Al-Ḥasan said: "*Taqiyyah* is permissible for a human until the Day of Resurrection, and there is no *Taqiyyah* in killing."

And Ibn Kathīr says: "'Except when taking precaution against them in prudence' meaning whoever fears in some countries and times from their evil, he has the right to treat them with precaution (*yattaqīhim*) by his apparent [behavior] not his inner self and intention. As Al-Bukhārī said on the authority of Abū Al-Dardā' that he said: 'We smile in the faces of people while our hearts curse them.' And Al-Thawrī said: Ibn ʻAbbās said: *Taqiyyah* is not by action; *Taqiyyah* is only by the tongue." And we told you there is another opinion of scholars that *Taqiyyah* is by speech and action.

Imām Al-Baghawī *raḥimahullāh* says: "Allāh forbade the believers from allying with disbelievers, compromising with them (*mudāhanatihim*), and taking them as intimates (*mubāṭanatihim*), except if the disbelievers are dominant and apparent, or the believer is among a disbelieving people, like those living in the lands of disbelievers, so he fears them, so he treats them diplomatically with the tongue while his heart is secure in Faith to defend himself, without legalizing (*yastaḥilla*) unlawful blood or unlawful wealth, or showing the disbelievers to the nakedness of Muslims. And *Taqiyyah* is not except with fear of killing and soundness of intention. The Exalted said: 'Except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith.'" This is clear speech and speech of gold.

So we can say there are two groups of scholars: A group said: *Taqiyyah* is Apparent *Muwālāh*. And a group said: It is merely Hiding Enmity or Showing Diplomacy by being soft with disbelievers. The saying of the second group who said it is Hiding Enmity infer with the saying of Allāh the Exalted: "O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of

them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people. So you see those in whose hearts is disease hastening into [association with] them, saying, 'We are afraid a misfortune may strike us.' But perhaps Allah will bring conquest or a decision from Him, and they will become, over what they have been concealing within themselves, regretful." [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 51-52]. Those mentioned in the verse, Allāh judged with their Kufr by their allying with disbelievers by His saying: "then indeed, he is [one] of them" despite their fear. Because they made the excuse "We are afraid a misfortune may strike us." So they were making excuses with fear. So Allāh the Exalted clarified in this verse that mere fear of the harm of disbelievers if they appear over the believers is not an excuse for hastening into allying with them. If fear licensed *Muwālāh*, Allāh would not have declared them disbelievers. So if fear licenses *Taqiyyah* and does not license *Muwālāh*, it is known by that that *Taqiyyah* is other than *Muwālāh*. The point is that *Taqiyyah* with this concept is other than *Muwālāh*, as Ibn al-Qayyim said: "*Taqiyyah* is not *Muwālāh*."

Because Ibn al-Qayyim, when he looked at the Quranic verses and these definitions, reached that *Taqiyyah* is hiding what is in the soul of enmity due to his fear of them; they restricted it to this. But those who viewed it as *Taqiyyah* being Apparent *Muwālāh* said it has the same conditions as Coercion; meaning *Taqiyyah* is not permissible except in specific cases: in cases of threat of killing or that a limb of his will be destroyed or he will be tortured severely, as we told you in the conditions of Coercion.

We can conclude that **Mere Fear**, which is the expected harm from disbelievers, licenses *Taqiyyah* by hiding enmity towards them or by treating them diplomatically. One says "I am afraid of them and I expect they will harm me," in this case it is licensed by hiding enmity, meaning you do not show him enmity and show him softness of speech. And we will speak on this issue *In shā' Allāh* regarding the difference between *Mudāhanah* and *Mudārah* in the next lesson, *In shā' Allāh*.

As for **Coercion**, it is the harm actually occurring from disbelievers, or that this tyrant or this one threatening you will execute it and you know that mostly he executes. So **Apparent *Muwālāh***, which is a type of Major Kufr, is licensed along with the security of the heart in Faith. Meaning if it was said to him: "Insult Allāh or the Messenger or prostrate to an idol or do anything," or he did [it] while they are threatening him with killing or destruction of a limb and he did [it], he is licensed in it, on the condition that his heart is secure in Faith.

But the confusion of the exegetes is what caused the problem, because they confused Fear and Coercion, and inferred for *Taqiyyah* with the verse of Coercion! Meaning when they mentioned *Taqiyyah* they said *Taqiyyah* is permissible but [cited] the saying of Allāh the Exalted: "Except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith." Therefore you will find people became lenient in considering *Taqiyyah* as Apparent *Muwālāh* considering that it is what is licensed in Coercion. But by verification of the apparent meaning of the verses and what Ibn al-Qayyim and other scholars said, the verses of Sūrah Āl 'Imrān with which those who are lenient in the issue of *Taqiyyah* and take license by it infer: "Let not believers take disbelievers as allies..." to His saying: "Except when taking precaution against them in prudence" means **Do not ally with them but guard against them and beware of them upon fearing them.**

This is what Imams Al-Baghawī, Al-Qurṭubī, and Ibn Kathīr mentioned in the interpretation of the verse.

Why did they say that? They mean that Apparent *Muwālāh* is not causing Takfīr unless coupled with Heartfelt *Muwālāh*, and they inferred with the subject of "Except when taking precaution against them in prudence" in this case. No, we said this is a corrupt condition fundamentally. Rather, allying with disbelievers in itself is Major Kufr, but we apply preventers and controls of Takfīr after that and look into the conditions and controls, which we spoke about, especially in the subject of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*.

So this which we spoke about... the reason for that is those who say Apparent *Muwālāh* is not causing Takfīr except with the condition of Heartfelt *Muwālāh*. Therefore they say *Taqiyyah* is Apparent *Muwālāh* to reach the issue that one can go along with disbelievers and say Kufr or do Kufr but this is permissible licensed *Taqiyyah*, and even one who does it in this case, it is not Major Kufr!

But we said to them: Even those who inferred among the scholars who said *Taqiyyah* is Apparent *Muwālāh* stipulated for it the restrictions in the verse of Sūrah Al-Naḥl 106 "Except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith." They stipulated in *Taqiyyah* the same conditions as Coercion. Meaning the one who practices *Taqiyyah* and cautions against disbelievers and allies with them apparently is assumed to be **Coerced**, Compelling Coercion, which is what we told you: either he fears he will be killed or a limb of his limbs destroyed or tortured severely.

This is what we have today and I do not want to burden you in this issue.

In shā' Allāh, in the next ninth lesson we will try to differentiate between other forms; like the difference between *Mudāhanah* and *Mudārah*. Because in the next lesson, *In shā' Allāh*, and the lesson after it is the end, we conclude with ten lessons, *In shā' Allāh*. So the next lesson is the penultimate lesson, and after it, *In shā' Allāh*, will be the last lesson *bi idhnillāh*. Although I summarized very much briefly. Perhaps Allāh will grant us success and we try to collect this material in a book if the situation is facilitated, *In shā' Allāh*. If not facilitated, this is what we have and may Allāh bless you.

We ask Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* to use us for the victory of this religion, and to make this speech of ours purely for His Noble Face. I say this statement of mine and ask Allāh for forgiveness for me and for you.

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Ninth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We praise Him for all good; we thank Him and are not ungrateful to Him. We cast off and forsake those who disobey Him. O Allāh, You alone we worship, to You we pray and prostrate, and towards You we strive and hasten. We hope for Your mercy and fear Your punishment; surely, Your serious punishment will overtake the disbelievers. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Honored brothers and good students, may Allāh greet you and welcome you.

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

Here we are with the ninth lesson among the lessons of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. *In shā' Allāh*, this will be the penultimate lesson; we will complete them with ten, *In shā' Allāh*. The next lesson will be the last lesson.

Our lesson today is about two points:

First Point: We will speak about the difference between **Diplomacy (*Mudārah*)** and **Compromise/Flattery (*Mudāhanah*)**.

Second Point: We will speak about **Naturalization (*Tajannus*)** and the ruling on naturalization with the citizenship of a disbelieving state.

So I hope for attention and focus because the issue of naturalization is among the issues of contemporary calamities (*Nawāzil*) and it is very dangerous. *In shā' Allāh*, we will try to deconstruct the issue and explain it with some simplification that is not detrimental.

As for the subject of *Mudārah* and *Mudāhanah*, some people used to confuse *Mudārah* and *Mudāhanah*, thinking they are the same. ***Mudārah*** in the Arabic language, as stated in *Al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* and other language dictionaries: "*Dara'ahu* meaning he pushed it back (*ja'alahu dar'an*) and *dara'ahu* meaning he repelled it. *Tadāra'ū* meaning they pushed each other in a dispute. *Tadara'ū* meaning they concealed themselves from a thing." Therefore Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar *raḥimahullāh* says: "*Al-Mudārah* without Hamza means courtesy (*Mujāmalah*) and gentleness (*Mulāyanah*). But with Hamza, its meaning is repelling/defending (*Mudāfa'ah*)." Ibn Baṭṭāl said in his *Explanation of Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*: "*Mudārah* is gentleness with the ignorant in teaching, and with the sinner in forbidding his action, and avoiding harshness upon him where he does

not show what he is upon, and disapproving of him with gentle speech and action, especially if there is a need to reconcile his heart and so on." This means that *Mudārah* revolves around gentleness and softness with the one you are calling, to reach a Shar‘ī objective.

Ibn al-Qayyim also has good speech on this subject in his book *Al-Rūḥ*: "The difference between *Mudārah* and *Mudāhanah* is that **Mudārah** is being gentle with a human to extract the truth from him or turn him away from falsehood. While **Mudāhanah** is being gentle with him to approve him upon his falsehood and leave him to his desire. Thus, *Mudārah* is for the people of Faith, and *Mudāhanah* is for the people of Hypocrisy."

There are many definitions by scholars in this matter and good speech on this subject. But what is the ruling on *Mudārah* from the Shar‘ī aspect?

Its ruling from the Shar‘ī aspect is **permissible** by the Book and the Sunnah and from the action of the Salaf. Some say it might be recommended (*Mandūb*) for a considered interest. They infer for that with some Ḥadīths and Quranic verses, as in Sūrah Al-Qaṣaṣ, Allāh the Exalted says:

وَيَدْرَءُونَ بِالْحَسَنَةِ السَّيِّئَةَ

"And they repel (*yadra’ūn*) evil with good" [QS. Al-Qaṣaṣ: 54]

And from the Sunnah what scholars narrated, as in *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*: From ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr from ‘Ā’ishah, the Mother of the Believers, that she informed him that ‘Uyaynah b. Ḥiṣn asked permission to enter upon the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. He *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "Permit him, and wretched is the son of the tribe (or wretched is the brother of the tribe)." When he entered, he spoke gently to him. So I said to him: "O Messenger of Allāh, you said what you said then you spoke gently to him?" He said: "O ‘Ā’ishah, indeed the worst of people in position with Allāh is the one whom people leave or abandon to avoid his obscenity (*Fuḥsh*)."

This indicates the permissibility of *Mudārah* in this case. Scholars have much speech in this matter, but the summary of this subject is that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* when he said: "Wretched is the son of the tribe (or wretched is the brother of the tribe)" then spoke gently to him... Scholars said: The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* teaches ‘Ā’ishah the Mother of the Believers and teaches the Companions that there are certain states for such a man. The Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* clarified his state so no one would be deceived

by him. So if he was gentle with him, this does not mean the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* is pleased with him, so let them beware. The Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* clarifies the state of criticism (*Jarḥ*) regarding this man, that he is "Wretched is the son of the tribe (or wretched is the brother of the tribe)" because he is harsh. And 'Uyaynah b. Ḥiṣn after that was among those who apostatized after the death of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*.

The point here is that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* clarified his state and was gentle with him, then said: "Indeed the worst of people in position with Allāh is the one whom people leave or abandon to avoid his obscenity." The Messenger was speaking gently to him so he would withhold his harm from people. But the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* did not remain silent about an evil done by 'Uyaynah b. Ḥiṣn, nor did he remain silent upon a false matter. He only entered, so he spoke gently to him, then he left. Meaning no false matter occurred, and 'Uyaynah did not bring a false thing before the Messenger. But he smiled at him and spoke to him gently and clarified his state, because the Messenger is the one who conveys from his Lord.

The point here is he says this is *Mudārah*, meaning you soften speech for him, are gentle with him, and kind to him because he is ignorant in learning and so on.

Therefore some scholars spoke about this *Mudārah* in differentiating between it and *Mudāhanah*. Some said: "**Mudārah** is repelling corruptive evil by gentle speech and abandoning harshness, and turning away from the wicked person if his evil is feared or a harm greater than what he is involved in occurs from him. *Mudārah* is legislated because it is repelling evil and pushing it back or alleviating it. And because in using it is distance from obscenity and being obscene. And because it is from the chapter of committing the lighter of two harms and the lesser of two evils, and doing the higher of two interests." As in the Ḥadīth we spoke about, the Ḥadīth of 'Uyaynah b. Ḥiṣn. And there is another Ḥadīth: "The worst of you is he whom people avoid fearing his obscenity." So this is the speech about *Mudārah*.

As for ***Mudāhanah***, *Mudāhanah* is from *Idhān* (Oiling/Lubricating), meaning as if he is oiling. The reality of this action is applying oil/fat (*Duhn*) to a thing, as if you are painting a thing, either to soften it or color it. Therefore the word *Idhān* or *Mudāhanah* was derived from it.

Therefore Al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ says about *Mudāhanah*: "**It is giving up the religion, cheating by lying, and beautifying the ugly.**" Meaning you

paint an ugly thing so you cover it and beautify it. This is contrary to *Mudārah*. So *Mudāhanah* is prohibited according to Shari'ah, due to the saying of Allāh *‘Azza wa Jalla*:

فَلَا تُطِعِ الْمُكَذِّبِينَ * وَدُّوا لَوْ تُدْهِنُ فَيُدْهِنُونَ

> "So do not obey the deniers. They wish that you would soften [in your position], so they would soften [toward you]" [QS. Al-Qalam: 8-9]

He made *Mudāhanah* an attribute of the deniers, and they desire its occurrence in every time and place from the Messengers.

And Ibn al-Qayyim, as we told you, says: "*Mudāhanah* is for the people of Hypocrisy." And Ibn Ḥajar says: "The control of *Mudārah* is that there be no impugning of the religion in it. While blameworthy *Mudāhanah* is that there be therein beautifying the ugly and validating the false." This is the *Mudāhanah* which is not permissible according to Shari'ah.

Therefore some define *Mudāhanah* as: "**Abandoning what is obligatory for Allāh of protective jealousy (*Ghayrah*), advice, enjoining good, and forbidding evil for a worldly purpose and self-desire.** And seeking intimacy with people of sins, accompanying them, eating with them, drinking with them, sitting with them, and not disapproving of them while having the ability to disapprove, seeking to attract their affection and love, pleasing them, making peace with them, and not distinguishing between their ranks; because they saw that conduct with people, good character, and attaining livelihood is not achieved except by that." This is compromise/truce (*Muhādanah*), not good character nor anything. He compromises with them on their evil and does not disapprove even though he can disapprove. This is the *Mudāhanah* prohibited according to Shari'ah, contrary to the Messengers and their followers, and exiting from the path of the believers and their methodology. Since it is preferring the fortunes of the self, ease, making peace with people, leaving enmity for the sake of Allāh, and bearing harm for His essence. This in reality is destruction itself; because he has not tasted the flavor of Faith who does not ally for Allāh and show enmity for Allāh. Rather Faith is attained by opposing (*Murāghamah*) the enemies of Allāh, preferring His pleasure, and anger if His prohibitions are violated.

So what heart is this, as Ibn al-Qayyim says, that remains in his chest while he has lost life, protective jealousy, glorification, and anger for Allāh, and equated the wicked and the good in his dealing, alliance, and enmity.

One equates truth and falsehood, the Ally and the Enemy, Satan and the Most Merciful. How is this?! This is considered opposition to the methodology of the Messengers, *Ḥarām*, not permissible according to Shari'ah, and its doer is on the brink of destruction.

Thus, this is *Mudāhanah*. And *Mudāhanah*, as we told you, differs from *Mudārah*. For *Mudārah* is permissible, whereas *Mudāhanah* is not permissible.

We come to the main point of research, which is the issue of: **The Ruling on Naturalization (*Tajannus*) with the citizenship of a state of the states of Kufr.**

Is it permissible to naturalize with the citizenship of a state of the states of Kufr?

Before we enter this subject, the brothers must pay attention. There is a simple matter I will pave the way for.

"**Citizenship (*Jinsiyyah*)**" is a Western term, a term Europe agreed upon at that time, and they established the state and this bond called Citizenship. This is a Calamity (*Nāzilah*) among the calamities that was not known to the scholars nor jurists of Muslims of old.

When this term, i.e., Citizenship, appeared, the Islamic world was occupied in its entirety. Almost most of the Islamic [world] was occupied entirely and was in a state of weakness, fragmentation, and deterioration. Europe and the West were in a fierce Crusader campaign against the Islamic world, and the Islamic world was either under the yoke of direct occupation, or via what is called Mandate and otherwise. So this term appeared, and Europe and the West and the occupying state passed it and beautified it for the Muslims at that time.

Scholars refuted at that time when this *Nāzilah* descended, especially in the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth Hijri century, meaning what is called the beginning of the twentieth century or in the middle of the nineteenth Gregorian century. Scholars appeared who addressed this subject and this *Nāzilah*; because the subject of Citizenship was at that time linked to the issue of Colonialism and the issue of Occupation. Therefore scholars said in this period the prohibition of Citizenship and considered whoever naturalizes at that time as an apostate and outside the fold of the Millah. We will recount to you in detail what happened.

But after that, some people began permitting it as a result of interaction (*Iḥtikāk*), changing circumstances, and that many states gained independence, even if nominally, and migration to the West occurred. So

contemporary scholars also changed their view in Shar‘ī rulings and permitted naturalization; either they permitted it absolutely, some permitted it with very strict conditions, and some did not permit it at all. And even the one who permitted it permitted it with exception. We will review the schools that said that.

But the origin of this issue existed long ago, but not in this manner of Naturalization or Citizenship; it was in the manner of the issue of **Migration (*Hijrah*) from the Abode of Kufr (*Dār al-Kufr*) to the Abode of Islam (*Dār al-Islām*)**. The Mālikī, Ẓāhirī, and Ibāḍī scholars, and Al-Shawkānī, and even among the later ones, most of these scholars of old said that whoever becomes Muslim in a land of the lands of Kufr must go out migrating to the Abode of Islam, and that residence in the Abode of Kufr is forbidden for him as long as he finds a way to migration.

Scholars spoke about this speech. Ibn Ḥazm spoke about it in *Al-Muḥallā*, and Ibn Aṭfīsh, who is from the Ibāḍīs, spoke about it in his book *Sharḥ Kitāb al-Nīl wa Shifā' al-'Alīl*. The Mālikī scholars also spoke in *Al-Mudawwanah al-Kubrā*, and some other scholars spoke on this subject in the footnotes of books of old.

They said it is forbidden for a Muslim to reside, even if born in the same Abode, and that he must go out whenever he finds a way to that. They inferred with the saying of Allāh the Exalted:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَوَفَّاهُمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ ظَالِمِي أَنفُسِهِمْ قَالُوا فِيمَ كُنتُمْ ۖ قَالُوا كُنَّا مُسْتَضْعَفِينَ فِي الْأَرْضِ ۚ قَالُوا أَلَمْ تَكُنْ أَرْضُ اللَّهِ وَاسِعَةً فَتُهَاجِرُوا فِيهَا ۚ فَأُولَٰئِكَ مَأْوَاهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ ۖ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا * إِلَّا الْمُسْتَضْعَفِينَ مِنَ الرِّجَالِ وَالنِّسَاءِ وَالْوِلْدَانِ لَا يَسْتَطِيعُونَ حِيلَةً وَلَا يَهْتَدُونَ سَبِيلًا * فَأُولَٰئِكَ عَسَى اللَّهُ أَن يَعْفُوَ عَنْهُمْ ۚ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ عَفُوًّا غَفُورًا * وَمَن يُهَاجِرْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ يَجِدْ فِي الْأَرْضِ مُرَاغَمًا كَثِيرًا وَسَعَةً ۚ وَمَن يَخْرُجْ مِن بَيْتِهِ مُهَاجِرًا إِلَى اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ ثُمَّ يُدْرِكْهُ الْمَوْتُ فَقَدْ وَقَعَ أَجْرُهُ عَلَى اللَّهِ ۗ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ غَفُورًا رَّحِيمًا

"Indeed, those whom the angels take [in death] while wronging themselves - [the angels] will say, 'In what [condition] were you?' They will say, 'We were oppressed in the land.' The angels will say,

> 'Was not the earth of Allah spacious [enough] for you to emigrate therein?' For those, their refuge is Hell - and evil it is as a destination. Except for the oppressed among men, women and children who cannot devise a plan nor are they directed to a way - For those it is expected that Allah will pardon them, and Allah is ever Pardoning, Forgiving. And whoever emigrates for the cause of Allah will find on the earth many [alternative] locations and abundance. And whoever leaves his home as an emigrant to Allah and His Messenger and then death overtakes him - his reward has already become incumbent upon Allah. And Allah is ever Forgiving, Merciful." [QS. Al-Nisā': 97-100]

And they inferred with many verses, most of which are the verses we spoke about among the evidences of loyalty to Muslims and prohibition of *Muwālāh* to disbelievers and disavowal of them; almost the same evidences.

They also inferred with Ḥadīths, among them: "Migration does not cease until repentance ceases, and repentance does not cease until the sun rises from its west." And his saying, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*: "Migration does not cease as long as disbelievers are fought." The first Ḥadīth is authentic (*Ṣaḥīḥ*) and the second is authentic as well.

However, the majority of scholars from the Ḥanafīs, Shāfi'īs, Ḥanbalīs, Zaydīs, and others, and this is found in the book *Al-Mabsūṭ* by Al-Sarakhsī, and in *Tabyīn al-Ḥaqā'iq* by Al-Zayla'ī, and found in *Kashf al-Qinā'* and others, all these scholars said: "**The permissibility of residence in the lands of Kufr if the Muslim is able to manifest the rites of his religion, learn what is obligatory upon him of rulings, is secure regarding himself and his family from Fitnah, and the Imam — meaning the Caliph— did not request him; proceeding from the fact that the default in that is permissibility (*Ḥill*), and that prohibition is only for an accidental cause of persecution, Fitnah, or otherwise.**" However, in the end they said that migration is recommended (*Mustaḥabb*) to increase the numbers (*Sawād*) of Muslims.

So the Ẓāhirīs, Mālikīs, Ibāḍīs, and others said absolute prohibition. As for these, they said it is permissible but recommended to go to Muslim lands, migrating to increase their numbers. But they have conditions: If he is secure regarding himself from Fitnah, and if he is able to declare [religion] and speak, and all these conditions they stipulated for moving from the Abode of Kufr to the Abode of Islam.

Those permitting have evidences naturally, meaning Ḥanafīs, Shāfi'īs, Ḥanbalīs, and others and Zaydīs have evidences, among them:

The Ḥadīth in which a Bedouin asked the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* about migration. He said: "Woe to you! Indeed the matter of migration is severe. Do you have camels?" He said: "Yes." He said: "Do you give their Sadaqah?" He said: "Yes." He said: "**Then work from beyond the seas, for indeed Allāh will not decrease anything from your work.**" This Ḥadīth is authentic and agreed upon. And among them also a Ḥadīth from the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*: "**There is no migration after the Conquest [of Mecca], but Jihad and intention. And if you are called forth, go forth.**"

So we have two opinions: One permitting with the recommendation of migration, and they infer with these evidences as the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said to the Bedouin "Stay with the camels and give their Sadaqah," meaning he made an exception for him. And the Ḥadīth "There is no migration after the Conquest but Jihad and intention."

However, as we said, they have conditions and restrictions, among them that you can preserve your religion, are secure regarding yourself from Fitnah, and the Imam did not request you; meaning if the Imam requested you and told you "Return," you must return.

We have a situation now: A Muslim residing in the lands of disbelievers, secure regarding himself from Fitnah, able to manifest rites, does not ally with disbelievers, and is empowered (*Mutamakkin*); meaning a Muslim having all good qualities in the lands of disbelievers. Is residence permissible for him despite all this? Or is migration to Muslim lands obligatory upon him?

Naturally, the majority said: Residence is permissible for him as long as he is empowered, but it is recommended for him to migrate to increase the numbers of Muslim lands.

Scholars of old were speaking during the existence of the Abode of Caliphate and the Abode of Authority, and Shari'ah was established and Islam was ruling, and whatever was other than it were purely Kufr states or Abode of War. As for now, Islamic governments now do not rule by the Law of Allāh; there is no difference between them and the existing disbelievers. This is what those who permit residence here inferred with. He says there is no difference between them; these do not rule by Islam, legislate usury, oppress people, and spread corruption in the land as well. Meaning there is no difference except the Muslim people only. But the existing government and state encourage corruption. On the contrary, these states called "Islamic" are intransigent with people who want residence and treat them as foreigners. Meaning if an Egyptian wanted to go to Algeria or Tunisia, they treat him as a foreigner. And the opposite is like this also;

if any Muslim from any country in the world went to Egypt, they treat him as a foreigner. And in the Gulf states, they are also intransigent; you must be in a job, and you cannot be treated in hospitals nor otherwise, and they deal with you as a foreigner.

So rulings are not taken like this all at once. Or the ruling that was from the days of Ibn Bādīs for example and the days of Sheikh Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā and others, days of French colonialism, British colonialism, or Portuguese colonialism and others; it is not correct to apply it to our days now. This is the argument of those who speak about the permissibility of residence in the lands of Kufr.

This *Nāzilah* which we are in now (Issue of **Naturalization with the citizenship of a disbelieving state**); so what is the ruling on obtaining this citizenship?

First: What is the meaning of Citizenship (*Jinsiyyah*) and its definition?

Scholars of old, as I told you, did not know this because it is a *Nāzilah* and a new term. But the Arabic language knows the word "*Jins*." The word *Jins* in the Arabic language means: "A type/kind of everything; it is of people, birds, and things. So people are a *Jins*, camels are a *Jins*, cows are a *Jins*." *Jins* means division from higher to lower, meaning what is more general to what is more specific. So the Genus (*Jins*) is divided into Species (*Anwā'*), Species into Categories (*Aṣnāf*), and Category into Individuals (*Ashkhāṣ*) and so on. You find this in definitions and the study of Logic and otherwise. Even those who study in Faculties of Law or Shari'ah and Law etc. study a subject called "Naturalization or Citizenship," a large book speaking about it in detail; because all these are political issues and definitions and theories having no relation to Islam because they are from the West. Therefore Muslim scholars confronted them in their cradle because the Islamic world was colonized at that time.

But what is its meaning according to legal experts?

"**It is a political and legal bond between the individual and the state.**" Some say: "It is a political, legal, and social bond." Some consider it, as the International Court of Justice defined it: "A legal bond based essentially on a social bond and effective solidarity in living, interests, and feelings, along with the correlation between rights and duties."

Naturalization (*Tajannus*) differs from **Citizenship (*Jinsiyyah*)**. Citizenship: one born on this land from parents, for example Egyptian or Algerian, or one of them the father at least, and they have conditions. Here

he is granted citizenship automatically without his choice, merely by birth; this is **Original Citizenship**. As for Naturalization, it differs.

Naturalization means: "**A request for affiliation of a human to the citizenship of a state among states and its agreement to accept him into the count of its subjects. From that naturalization arises the submission of the naturalized person to the laws of the state whose citizenship he naturalized with, and his acceptance of it willingly or unwillingly, and his commitment to defend it in case of war.**" So Naturalization is a voluntary act by which one of the subjects of a certain state obtains membership of the subjects of another state.

But sometimes this Naturalization is not voluntary in some cases. Meaning sometimes citizenship comes as a grant. It might be on the birthday of the Queen or King, or the country won the World Cup or otherwise, so they say: "All residents in this country from period such-and-such to such-and-such, we granted them citizenship." Or that some people reside in this country and are called a minority in it, so they take citizenship automatically even though they are a minority. Like what is happening now in what is called Myanmar which was called Burma, in the Rohingya tribe, and they are originally Muslims, although they are from the origin of the lands. The Buddhists tried to withdraw citizenship from them, but they gave them Burmese citizenship considering they are subjects even though they are a minority. Sometimes they used to expel them and withdraw it from them.

And as in China for example in East Turkestan, they considered them a minority and gave everyone born Chinese citizenship despite his nose, even though they say "We are not Chinese," but by rule of force and rule of law, they obtain this citizenship.

We are speaking about **Voluntary Naturalization**. Therefore Naturalization has effects. Among its effects:

Gaining the attribute of **Citizenship (*Muwāṭanah*)**; means enjoying all rights enjoyed by the original citizen and commitment to all duties he is committed to. Naturally, this is the default, but from the practical aspect it is not like this. For example, the British here give you citizenship, yes, but they have secret internal divisions. For example, the naturalized person is a degree different from the one of the country's origin; they distinguish between them even in work. And he does not reach the helm of rule with them. No one reaches the helm of rule like what happened in America and otherwise, no. The subject here in Europe differs and is very strict. No one among the naturalized can reach that easily except specific anomalous cases, as in the case of those of Jewish origin who might be tolerated, or

one who Christianizes later like Sarkozy in France. All these were originally Jews etc. and Christianized so they reach the helm of rule. This is a type of laxity with them but it is not generalized and this does not happen to any Muslim.

But in the end, the default in it is equality between everyone; between the original citizen born of two disbelieving Western parents and the citizen who acquired this citizenship whether he requested it by choice or otherwise. In this case, he equals them in rights of citizenship and permanent residence. The state protects him diplomatically and consulates undertake his defense and his interests are met, and he enjoys political rights like the right to vote etc.

And naturally he has duties; he submits to the laws of the state, participates in its army, commitment to defend it, represents the state externally, and his participation in building the state. Scholars spoke on this subject in detail, but this is so the brothers understand the meaning of the word Citizenship briefly and laws of naturalization because they have theories and books. But this is a preface for speech in the Shar'ī aspect.

We enter into the opinions of scholars. We will divide them into schools or sayings:

The First Saying: The school of those saying **Prohibition (Absolute Prevention)**. They said: It is not permissible at all to naturalize with the citizenship of non-Islamic states. This is what most contemporary jurists are upon. Among the first who said that is Sheikh Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā author of *Al-Manār*, Sheikh 'Alī Maḥfūẓ the Azharī scholar author of the book *Al-Ibdā' fī Maḍārr al-Ibtidā'*, Sheikh Muḥammad 'Abd al-Bāqī Zarqānī, Sheikh Sharīf Maḥfūẓ Mufti of Lebanon long ago, Sheikh Yūsuf al-Dijwī, Sheikh 'Abd al-Laṭīf b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, the scholar 'Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Bādīs, the scholar Al-Bashīr al-Ibrāhīmī, members of the Association of Algerian Muslim Scholars, and the Permanent Committee for Scholarly Research and Ifta in Saudi Arabia. Naturally among contemporary Sheikhs is Sheikh Ibn 'Uthaymīn and others. Even Dr. Al-Būṭī is among those prohibiting that, although he is among the defenders of this criminal Bashar Al-Assad and the Nuṣayrīs, and prays behind them! The funny thing is he prays behind the Nuṣayriyyah yet despite that he is among the prohibitionists and says impermissibility of naturalization with citizenships of non-Islamic states.

But I wanted you to know the story of this first opinion. The evidences of this opinion are very strong, yes. Therefore I have here the book *Fatāwā al-Sheikh Rashīd Riḍā* in the fifth volume. Pay attention to this question which reached the Sheikh *raḥimahullāh* and how he answered

it, because the question came to him from the Tunisian National Party at that time. The question is thus in *Al-Fatāwā*:

"What is the saying of His Eminence, the Possessor of Virtue, the Great Professor Sheikh Rashīd Riḍā, may Allāh support him, regarding the government of France ruling over many Islamic peoples, since it resorted recently to establishing a law known as the Naturalization Law. The purpose of it is to induce the inhabitants of those lands among Muslims to exit from their Millah and increase the numbers of its followers. It made this naturalization a condition for obtaining political rights which belonged to them before, and robbed them of them by way of unjust tyranny. Along with the fact that the Muslim's following of this Millah makes him deny in action what is known from religion by necessity, and Shar‘ī rulings do not cover him. Rather he becomes follower of man-made laws whose texts are explicit in permitting Zina, consuming alcohol, committing immorality, legalizing Usury, earning from illegitimate ways, preventing polygamy and considering what exceeds one [wife] as a type of punishable Zina, denying the lineage of what is born to him outside the state of its existence with no right for him in maintenance nor inheritance nor upon assumption of affiliation, dissolving the bond of marriage and assigning it to the court such that if he initiates divorce himself it is null, division of inheritances in a way contrary to Shar‘ī shares, and making their shares equal between females and males. And more severe tribulation than all this is making the Muslim forced into military service in an enemy army prepared to fight Muslims, humiliate them, and coerce them into submission and throwing themselves into the grip of one who observes concerning them no pact of kinship nor keeps a covenant with them. Is the undertaking of that government of a matter like this considered breaking the treaty placed upon those Muslims and a Fitnah for them in their religion and a disruption of the system of their society? And are those Muslims, if they accept this naturalization, considered apostates from their religion so we do not treat them with the treatment of Muslims like marriage, inheritance, eating their slaughtered meat, and burying their dead in Muslim cemeteries because they were pleased with shedding the rulings of Shari'ah and there is no coercer for them to do that? Or how is the case? And is it permissible for a Muslim who realizes the consequences of this blind Fitnah and the calamities of silence about it to abandon disapproving of it? While the situation is that he is secure regarding himself and able to resist it and show disapproval of it. Give us a fatwa in this incident with what Shar‘ī examination requires as guidance for the confused and a warning for the heedless. May Allāh keep you for the service of Islam and Muslims."

Naturally, Allāh opened up for the Sheikh and he commenced answering the question in several pages of his book. We summarize from it that he inferred **Prohibition** and considered the case described by the questioner, i.e., the Tunisian National Party at that time, that this case is **Kufr and Apostasy from Islam** and it is not permissible to bury them in their cemeteries... etc., from everything he asked him. He answered him based on the case he was upon according to the question.

The proponents of this school inferred with evidences, among them: Naturalization with the citizenship of non-Islamic states, they said, involves loyalty to disbelievers, inclining toward them, affection for them, and obedience to them in matters contradicting the Law of Allāh the Exalted. And Allāh *'Azza wa Jalla* has forbidden all that in numerous verses. He said: "Let not believers take disbelievers as allies rather than believers. And whoever [of you] does that has nothing with Allah, except when taking precaution against them in prudence." And He said: "O you who have believed, do not take the disbelievers as allies instead of the believers. Do you wish to give Allah against you a clear authority?" And He said: "O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people." You remember the evidences I recited to you in the lesson of Evidences in *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*? They are the same evidences used by those who prohibited naturalization with the citizenship of a disbelieving state.

I will not be able to read all the evidences used by Rashīd Riḍā and other scholars, because it is not only him: Sheikh Al-Bashīr al-Ibrāhīmī and many scholars said prohibition of that, whether obtaining French citizenship and naturalizing with it whether in Algeria or Tunisia at that time.

And they inferred with Ḥadīths, among them: The Ḥadīth of Samurah b. Jundub from the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* that he said: "Whoever joins the polytheist and lives with him then he is like him." This is in *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* with an authentic chain authenticated by Sheikh Al-Albānī. And his saying, *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*: "I am free of every Muslim who resides among the polytheists. They said: O Messenger of Allāh, why? He said: Their fires should not be visible to one another." Naturally some defeated contemporaries tried to weaken this Ḥadīth, but it is a Ḥadīth authenticated by Al-Albānī and others, and its narrations are many and require pages for us to speak on those who weakened it.

And in an authentic Ḥadīth also in *Sunan Al-Nasā'ī* that the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "Allāh does not accept from a polytheist after he has become Muslim any deed until he separates from the polytheists to the Muslims." This is an authentic Ḥadīth as well. And in a Ḥadīth in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* from Sulaymān b. Buraydah from his father who said: The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* whenever he appointed a commander over an army or expedition, he advised him with matters, mentioning among them: "Then invite them to move from their abode to the abode of the Emigrants (*Muhājirīn*)." A Ḥadīth in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

Naturally, they enumerated the evils and evidences: That naturalization with citizenships of disbelieving states means referring for judgment voluntarily and by choice to its laws contradicting Shari'ah. And referring for judgment to Kufri laws contradicting Shari'ah is Apostasy from Islam. And whoever rejects the rule of Islam is an Apostate by consensus. They said the evidence for that is:

أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّهُمْ آمَنُوا بِمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أُنزِلَ مِن قَبْلِكَ يُرِيدُونَ أَن يَتَحَاكَمُوا إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ أُمِرُوا أَن يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ وَيُرِيدُ الشَّيْطَانُ أَن يُضِلَّهُمْ ضَلَالًا بَعِيدًا * وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ مَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ وَإِلَى الرَّسُولِ رَأَيْتَ الْمُنَافِقِينَ يَصُدُّونَ عَنكَ صُدُودًا

> "Have you not seen those who claim to have believed in what was revealed to you and what was revealed before you? They wish to refer legislation to Taghut, while they were commanded to reject it; and Satan wishes to lead them far astray. And when it is said to them, 'Come to what Allah has revealed and to the Messenger,' you see the hypocrites turning away from you in aversion." [QS. Al-Nisā': 60-61]

Also, there are countries that legalize in their laws the unanimously agreed *Ḥarām* and prohibit the unanimously agreed *Ḥalāl*. They legalize Kufr and prohibit what is known from religion by necessity. And naturalization entails duties, foremost among them: Participation in the army of the state granting citizenship and defending it even if its war is against Muslims. This is among the greatest *Muwālāh* for polytheists, and the mentioned texts all indicate that.

أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ نَافَقُوا يَقُولُونَ لِإِخْوَانِهِمُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ لَئِنْ أُخْرِجْتُمْ لَنَخْرُجَنَّ مَعَكُمْ

"Have you not considered those who practiced hypocrisy, saying to their brothers who have disbelieved among the People of the Scripture, 'If you are expelled, we will surely leave with you...'" [QS. Al-Ḥashr: 11]

Naturally, you remember among the evidences for that the fatwa of Sheikh Al-Qaraḍāwī which Counselor Ṭāriq Al-Bishrī signed, and Haytham Al-Khayyāṭ and Muḥammad Salīm Al-'Awwā signed. This ominous fatwa which they have not retracted until now! This fatwa in which they permitted, to preserve citizenship and avoid questioning their loyalty to Americans, they permitted the American Muslim soldier to participate with the invading American forces of Afghanistan even if it led to killing Afghan soldiers! Imagine this! They said because if he does not participate, Muslims will be looked at with an eye of doubt in loyalty and perhaps citizenship will be denied and so on!!

Is it permissible for one coerced to kill to kill?! We said even the one coerced to kill, by consensus, it is not permissible for him to do that. And in the Ḥadīth of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*: "The demise of the world is lesser with Allāh than the killing of a Muslim man."

Some scholars sometimes in this Ḥadīth read it thus: "The demise of the world is lesser with Allāh than the killing of people! Or killing a man!" And they delete the word "Muslim" from the Ḥadīth! The Ḥadīth says about a Muslim man. This Ḥadīth is authentic, narrated by Al-Tirmidhī from 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* from the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*.

Naturally, those who use that are some secularized ones and some Islamists who have the taint of secularism and democracy.

So this is the accredited, old, basic (original) opinion, which is **Prohibition of Naturalization Absolutely**.

Some scholars of the Maghrib long ago relied on the speech of the scholar Al-Wansharīsī, author of *Al-Mi'yār al-Mu'rib*, and he was speaking about the issue of Muslims who were in Andalusia at that time. He said: "It is obligatory upon every believer who believes in Allāh and the Last Day to strive to preserve the capital of Faith by distancing and fleeing from residing with the enemies of the Beloved of the Most Merciful; because residing with disbelievers, other than *Ahl al-Dhimmah* and [under]

subjection (*Ṣaghār*), is not permissible nor allowed for an hour of a day, due to what it produces of filth, dirt, and religious and worldly corruptions throughout lifetimes."

And the speech of Ibn Rushd al-Mālikī in *Al-Muqaddimāt wa al-Mumahhidāt*: "If it is obligatory by the Book, Sunnah, and Consensus of the Ummah that whoever becomes Muslim in the Land of War must migrate to the Abodes of Muslims, then how is it permitted for anyone to enter a land where their rulings run over him?!"

And they said: "There is no excuse for these naturalized ones because they are not coerced so that we say what Allāh the Exalted said: 'Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief... except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith' [QS. Al-Naḥl: 106]. Rather they are choosers, pleased. And what they expect behind naturalization of worldly debris and immediate fortunes is not a justification for this naturalization. Rather, a man must flee with his religion whenever he can, even if his world goes. Read if you wish His saying: 'Say, "If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your wives, your relatives, wealth which you have obtained, commerce wherein you fear decline, and dwellings with which you are pleased are more beloved to you than Allah and His Messenger and jihad in His cause, then wait until Allah executes His command. And Allah does not guide the defiantly disobedient people."' [QS. Al-Tawbah: 24]."

So those who prohibited naturalization used the evidences of residing in the Abode of Kufr. They are a group of scholars who were contemporary to the British occupation in Egypt and the French occupation of the Islamic Maghrib at that time. They are the ones who spoke about these evidences in detail. The first who confronted it were these, whether Sheikh Al-Bashīr al-Ibrāhīmī or Sheikh Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā in his books, and naturally Sheikh Aḥmad Shākir who prohibited that and considered it Apostasy as well. All these scholars who were contemporary to the occupation prohibited naturalization.

This is the First Opinion which says **Prohibition**, that it is not permissible, and that it is Apostasy.

The Second Opinion: They said **Permissibility**. It is an opinion opposite to the first. They said it is permissible to naturalize with citizenships of non-Islamic states. This is a famous opinion of the most famous of these [scholars], at their head Dr. Wahbah Al-Zuḥaylī, and Dr. Yūsuf Al-Qaraḍāwī, as you know he is the Father of Facilitations (*Abū al-Tasāhīl*), *mā shā' Allāh*! And Sheikh Shādhilī Nayfar, a Tunisian scholar, and Sheikh Fayṣal Mawlawī the Ikhwānī in Lebanon, who died a month ago, and others. These said: Permissibility of naturalization with the

condition of preserving the religion, holding fast to it, and not melting into the society. But the restriction they restricted it with is preserving the religion, holding fast to it, and not melting into the society.

What are their evidences? They inferred with evidences containing general absolutes; like their saying that Islamic Shari'ah came to preserve the Five Universals (*Al-Kulliyyāt al-Khams*) which are: Religion, Life, Intellect, Lineage/Honor, and Wealth. Everything that is a way to preserve these necessities is legitimate (*Mashrū'*). And naturalization with citizenships of these states provides for the human a dignified life, tranquility, security, and enjoyment of rights and freedoms mostly lacking in Islamic states in our contemporary reality. Rather, it facilitates for him worship, Da'wah, and spreading knowledge in a way having no parallel in Islamic states because Western states are based on secularism, absolute liberalism, and public freedoms which peoples guard and hold fast to, and regimes cannot touch these public freedoms. Hence, naturalization under these conditions achieves many Islamic interests. So if naturalization is a means to achieve these legitimate interests, then it is legitimate.

There is a valuable book that reviewed these opinions by Khālid 'Abd al-Qādir titled *Fiqh al-Aqalliyyāt al-Muslimah* (Jurisprudence of Muslim Minorities). There is also a research by Muḥammad Taqī al-Dīn al-'Uthmānī in a journal called *Buḥūth fī Qaḍāyā Fiqhiyyah Mu'āṣirah* (Researches in Contemporary Jurisprudential Issues), and *Al-Fiqh al-Islāmī* journal, and *Al-Buḥūth al-Islāmiyyah* journal also volume number 32. They reviewed such things a lot and these calamities in detail, and I summarize from all this.

They refuted those who prohibited naturalization among the people of knowledge; "They only prohibited it fearing melting into the Western personality. As for if citizenship gives the naturalized person strength, firmness, and ability to demand rights, express opinion, and vote in elections...", meaning they justified it that scholars were afraid of what happened to France when it considered Algeria a province and gave citizenship to Jews and many Algerians in these countries to buy their loyalty and to install them in the rule of these countries later. But this subject is missing now, and there is no melting nor anything, and people can enter elections, naturally this is another research: Are elections permissible fundamentally in Muslim lands so we can speak about elections in disbeliever lands!

They said: "Residence in the lands of Kufr is permissible if one can establish his religion, manifest it, and is secure. Naturalization does not add to residence except mere affiliation to the state." Naturally they spoke about

Interests (*Maṣāliḥ*), weighing the better of two goods, repelling the worse of two evils, and acquiring the greater of two interests; i.e., the speech of Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. They also have a fatwa in the International Institute of Islamic Thought in Washington; they said: "Even if a Muslim naturalized with this citizenship to call its people to Islam or convey Shar'ī rulings to Muslims residing there, he is rewarded for that, let alone it being permissible"!

Dr. Al-Qaraḍāwī is also from the same school. He permitted this subject and said that this gives opportunity for people to go, especially those who are chased, and that it gives opportunity in movement and so on. Meaning they speak about realistic cases.

There are people who said: It is **permissible with specific conditions**; meaning prohibition of naturalization except for **Necessity**. They stipulated three conditions for Necessity: Blocking of the doors of the Islamic world in the face of his resorting to them, meaning the one resorting to them requesting naturalization. That he harbors the intention to return whenever that is facilitated. That he chooses the country where he practices his religion freely. Meaning it is permissible in these exceptional cases.

This was said by Dr. 'Abd al-Karīm Zaydān, an Iraqi Doctor and Jurist belonging to the Muslim Brotherhood. He stipulated these conditions and says it is not permissible and is prohibited except in a specific exceptional case. He speaks about one compelled to Political or Humanitarian Asylum where only the government of that disbelieving country accepted him, or the Muslim was originally from the people of that disbelieving country and cannot go out to a Muslim country to be in. Meaning one born and became Muslim in Britain for example and cannot go out, so here he will obtain the citizenship of the disbelieving state in this case because he is compelled to that, because he cannot find another country.

This school is closer to the First School, because it prevents and prohibits absolutely but excepts a special case, which is the case of what is called Political or Humanitarian Asylum, a chased human and no government in the world can shelter him except these disbelieving governments, or the case of a Muslim born there and compelled to this because he cannot go out. But with the condition that even if he went to them as a political refugee or humanitarian asylum or result of a disaster among disasters like our brothers in Somalia and others, in this case he intends to return.

Some scholars detailed, and we consider it another school among the schools. They said we can divide people into sections as in the book *Al-*

Aḥkām al-Siyāsiyyah li-l-Aqalliyyāt al-Muslimah by Dr. Sulaymān b. Muḥammad Topoljak. They divided into:

- **First Section:** Naturalization with the citizenship of the disbelieving state without a Shar'ī justification, rather out of preference for the disbelieving state and admiration for it, its people, and its rule. This is **Apostasy** from Islam. Meaning this section is an Apostate; because he requested naturalization without Shar'ī justification and he is happy and pleased with its people and rule, so this is a disbeliever exiting the Millah.
- **Second Section:** Naturalization for Muslim minorities who are **original inhabitants** of the country. It is **Legitimate (*Mashrū'*)**, and upon them is spreading Islam in their countries and harboring the intention for migration if a state for Islam is established and needs him. Meaning people who are a minority present from the people of the country and are originally Muslims from the start, like East Turkestan in China or the Champa in Vietnam and also in Arakan region. These are Muslim minorities but holding citizenship of those states; in this case they are compelled to this, but they harbor the intention if they are able to migrate, and upon them is spreading Islam in their places.
- **Third Section:** Naturalization for Muslim minorities who were **not from the people of the disbelieving country**. We can divide this into sections: Minority people entered and increased like Pakistanis, Indians, Bengalis, Arabs, Africans, and all these nationalities of Muslims who migrated, and Iraqis and Somalis made a large minority in the West now. They divided this into cases: That a Muslim leaves his country due to **compulsion and persecution** and resorts to this state; it is **permissible** with the condition of real compulsion for asylum, and that security is realized for the Muslim and his family in the land of Kufr, and that he can establish his religion there, and intends to return to the land of Islam whenever facilitated, and disapproves of evil even if with his heart while not melting into societies of Kufr. From this same section also: That a Muslim leaves his country intending lands of Kufr for the sake of **sustenance (*Qūt*)**, meaning he left his country to seek provision, and most of these are like this, so if he remained in his country he and his family would perish. This is a special case, meaning he went out because if he didn't go out he would die. In this case, he has the right to naturalize if he cannot remain without his citizenship. So in this case, if he would die in his country he and his family, it is permissible for him to naturalize if he lives in [the other] country

with the citizenship of a disbelieving state. There is also Naturalization for the **Interest of Islam and Muslims and Spreading Da‘wah**. They said this is **permissible**. If one went and it was for Da‘wah and spreading Islam, they considered this permissible in this case because this is an interest and he went with this intention, so they said this is permissible. Naturalization for mere **Worldly Purposes** without necessity nor interest for Islam and its people; this is **Prohibited (*Muḥarram*)**, like those who came to improve their living conditions! And the one who came to amass wealth or build himself a house or otherwise. They said this is not permissible according to Shari'ah.

These are the evidences in general on this subject. Naturally, the First Team who inferred with definitive texts prohibiting *Muwālāh* and referring judgment to other than Allāh and His Messenger for the prohibition of Naturalization leading to that prohibited [act]... it is accepted (*Musallam*) and there is no dispute among people of knowledge that this is not permissible. Meaning the opinion of scholars like Sheikh Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā and Sheikh Al-Bashīr al-Ibrāhīmī and many scholars at that time. But this case, they are speaking about a specific case which is that the lands of the Islamic world were colonized at that time. So they are speaking about Jihad against these colonizers, because the one who used to enter and accept naturalization with this citizenship, they considered him loyal to them and that he would fight against Muslims. Therefore the saying was decisive in this period.

Some said that mere Naturalization is considered a declaration by the person of his submission to rulings of Kufr and his acceptance of loyalty to Kufr and its people, whether he submitted in reality or did not submit. Then he will not be safe from falling into Ḥarām or participating in it; because the dye of society is like this.

Unlike Muslim states, for a person can find ample space and deal with them a Shar‘ī dealing. They said: What is the difference then? For what a person fears falling into in lands of Kufr is present among Muslims; oppression exists in Muslim lands, usury exists in them, Kufri rulings exist in them. Is there an established Shari'ah fundamentally?!

These rulings are in the case of the existence of an Islamic state establishing Shari'ah. But you are speaking about an oppressive state persecuting people and ruling by Kufri rulings in Muslim lands, and also oppressing them, imprisoning them, and chasing them. So it is the same. At least this one [in the West] is just and merciful.

Some scholars who prohibited this also said: That merely requesting citizenship is an explicit, decisive expression of your loyalty to the state whose citizenship you carry and of your submission to its system. Naturally there are very many refutations to this opinion. But from the practical aspect and realistic practices, there is no correlation that whoever has citizenship or naturalized means he is pleased with Kufr and pleased with them. The evidence for that is that one might be residing in Muslim lands and disbelieve merely by loving them and allying with them or being pleased with their Shari'ah even if he did not obtain any citizenship. So one might be in Mecca for example and is pleased and wishes his citizenship were British or English and is happy with their rulings; he disbelieves while he is there merely by this, and does not need naturalization or otherwise. Meaning the correlation is not necessary between one who has citizenship or naturalization; there is no correlation between this and that.

Naturally, the inferences used by scholars who spoke about preserving Shari'ah via the Five Universals, used by Sheikh Al-Qaraḍāwī, Sheikh Al-Zuḥaylī and others and Fayṣal Mawlawī, they said inferring by preserving Shari'ah via Universals (Religion, Life, Wealth etc.), scholars refuted them and said: "Preserving Shari'ah for the Five Universals is by legitimate ways, not by committing prohibitions nor by abandoning obligations. Furthermore, the interest of preserving Religion is prioritized over every interest other than it, and Naturalization is a destroyer of religion, a shaver of religiosity. So where is the interest then and where is preserving the Universals?!" This is a refutation from scholars.

"As for inferring by the rule of Bringing Interests and Repelling Evils (*Jalb al-Maṣāliḥ wa Dar' al-Mafāsid*), it is answered that the interest of security, prosperity, and ease is not prioritized over the interest of preserving religion. Otherwise we would be like those who made the trial of people like the punishment of Allāh. And is it correct that we prioritize these interests over repelling the evil of *Muwālāh* and referring judgment to other than Allāh and the evil of destroying offspring? Even if we assumed the existence of Necessity, Necessity is estimated by its extent, and Necessity is repelled by Residence." Meaning as long as there is Residence, there is no need for this Naturalization which binds you to these tribulations.

Naturally this is the summary because the subject is long, large, and thorny. And there are opinions; when you enter the books you might get lost, because they are very many researches. We spoke about them, and some studies, Master's and PhD theses and others all speak on this subject because it is among the *Nawāzil* in this time, and there are very many Ijtihāds and differences in it. But when we review all opinions we spoke

about now, we can say: **The Default (*Aṣl*) in the issue of Naturalization with citizenships of the Abode of Kufr is Prevention (*Man'*); it is prohibited (*Ḥarām*) and not permissible fundamentally.**

So we carry the evidences of the team that prevents upon this, that this is the Default. Naturally they are very strong evidences, and they are the evidences of *Muwālāh* we spoke about at the beginning of this course. But because, as we told you, the circumstances of Naturalization and Citizenship at that time were that the Islamic world was occupied, these fatwas were necessary for these scholars to strike with an iron hand those who naturalize because they consider them spies and traitors. Therefore scholars of old used not to bury them in Muslim cemeteries and prohibited marriage to them. Even the Council of Senior Scholars in Al-Azhar long ago issued such fatwas and said it is not permissible to bury them in Muslim cemeteries.

So this is the Default. But reality, we cannot take these issues all at once. A form might exist with specific evidence in a specific case permitting this prevention, as a compelling necessity estimated by its extent, or a supreme interest among general universal interests hoped to be achieved and there is no way to achieve it except by that. For example, the Caliph might come to you saying "Take this interest for a specific interest", I will not say about it now but you can understand thus, he says to you "Go and take it to acquire a supreme interest by which a specific thing and great benefit might be realized for Muslims or for an Imam among Imams of Muslims at that time," for example.

And there are very special cases like the case of one who seeks asylum in these lands and is compelled such that he cannot live except with this citizenship; perhaps they expel him or imprison him or constrict him and he cannot find a refuge for himself. These are special necessary cases. Or those born in these lands from minorities or originally was a disbeliever then became Muslim; this is like involuntary citizenship.

And why do we go far? Even citizenship in Muslim lands now, does it have a relation to Islam fundamentally?! Meaning this is citizenship also to which the same Law of Citizenship applies. This is "Chauvinistic Loyalty" and fanaticism for a specific race. This is against "Islam is superior and nothing is superior to it" as in the authentic Ḥadīth from the Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and like the Ḥadīth "We are one Ummah, the lowest of them strives with their protection (*Dhimmah*), and they are a hand against those other than them." These citizenships were taken from the West for fanaticism to a specific citizenship: Sudan for Sudanese, Egypt for Egyptians, Morocco for

Moroccans, Saudi Arabia for Saudis; Saudization, Algerianization, Egyptianization. All this speech and these terms, Allāh sent down no authority for them. This is from the chapter of dividing the Ummah. Therefore it is the same citizenship. Meaning if you obtain this citizenship which you obtain, it has conditions because you are born in that country so you take it by rule of birth. If you wanted to travel, you will not be able to get a passport unless you are from this country; meaning a passport with Egyptian citizenship, Moroccan citizenship, Tunisian citizenship... so you are compelled, otherwise people's interests will be disrupted in this case.

Thus it does not mean that this Naturalization existing now is, *mā shā' Allāh*, and is something from Islam. No, it does not mean that. This is an exceptional case in the history of the Islamic world, a general calamity imposed upon us by Colonialism via these laws which imposed these citizenships upon us and made bonds for them. It makes my Muslim brother in Sudan or my Muslim brother in Oman or Yemen a foreigner; he descends to Muslim lands as a foreigner, and they treat him as a foreigner. So these are citizenships with their corruption and destruction. They made loyalty, and this is at the core of *Al-Walā'*, they made loyalty, instead of being to Religion, they made loyalty now to this new bond (Bond of Citizenship): You are Egyptian, enough; you are Algerian, enough. Religion does not matter nor anything!

The evidence for that is they wrote in the Egyptian Constitution, among the most important texts for them, that the President of the Republic suffices to be from two Egyptian parents. And the word "Muslim" does not exist in the Constitution at all! That he be from two Muslim parents or be a Muslim from two Muslim parents. No, only Egyptian, so they open it for Christians, Jews, and every Tom, Dick, and Harry. So loyalty became to this bond.

So the Default in it is Prohibition and the Default in it is impermissibility. But whoever is compelled among Muslims naturalized originally with citizenships of Islamic lands to naturalize with citizenships of non-Islamic lands due to his persecution in his original country, or due to constriction upon him in his religion, self, or honor... Likewise whoever does not carry a citizenship originally like those called "**Bidūn**" (Stateless); one in Kuwait they do not give them, Saudi Arabia does not give them. How will he manage his life affairs? Therefore if he found a place giving them, like Britain gave them, France gave them, Holland and others; some European countries gave those called stateless. In this case, one who lost citizenship, he cannot move, cannot own property, and is constricted in everything, and this is in Muslim lands although they are Muslims!

Those called "Bidūn" exist in Muslim lands and are Muslims, and they deprive them. One might live fifty or sixty or seventy years and they do not give him citizenship, the citizenship of the country fundamentally, to take rights and duties and educate his children just as the rest living on the land learn!

So this Citizenship is truly a new religion. A new bond. Citizenship (*Muwāṭanah*) with Nationality (*Jinsiyyah*) replaced Religion unfortunately. So whoever is compelled due to constriction upon him in his religion, self, or honor, or carries no citizenship originally and is prevented from residence except by naturalization; these people, if they cannot repel harm by residence only and naturalization was inevitable and determined to repel their existing necessity, they have the right to naturalize from the chapter that Necessities permit Prohibitions. One will be deported or killed or imprisoned or subjected to torture; in this case, if he cannot repel this harm except by naturalization, he has the right to do that. This is a special case and not all people are like this, and it is an exceptional case and necessity. But the Default in it is that it is *Ḥarām* and it is not permissible originally to naturalize with this citizenship.

We recounted to you that some Muslims unfortunately diluted the subject as in the famous miserable fatwa, and I mentioned it in my book *Al-Ṣirā‘ bayna al-Mu’assasāt al-Dīniyyah wa al-Anẓimah al-Ḥākimah* as a model of humiliation at that time, it is the fatwa of Sheikh Dr. Al-Qaraḍāwī, and *Al-Sha‘b* newspaper published it on 19/10/2001. This fatwa is a shame and disgrace and a stain of shame on these Sheikhs: Dr. Yūsuf Al-Qaraḍāwī, Counselor Ṭāriq Al-Bishrī, Dr. Muḥammad Salīm Al-‘Awwā, Dr. Haytham Khayyāṭ, and Fahmī Huwaydī. All these are the ones who signed this American fatwa which permits the American soldier to fight for the sake of what they say: "Otherwise his loyalty to his state, meaning America, would be a place of doubt! With what that entails of numerous harms." Imagine! They consider this a justification and warrant for killing and participation! So this is an issue of loyalty and that he is in the army and drafted, meaning leave aside the issue of citizenship, in addition that it is permissible for him to kill this Afghan because if he does not do it they will kill him and he will be a place of doubt!

This is the fatwa of shame and disgrace due to this ominous citizenship imported by the Islamic world or imposed upon it from the West. It made some contemporary scholars diluted to the degree that they make this a warrant to justify killing a Muslim and participating with the occupation army, whether in Britain (British Muslim), or French Muslim, or the Muslim participating in the American army. It is a general fatwa for all these.

The summary in this is that the subject of Naturalization: the Default in it is Prohibition with the details detailed by scholars, and some permit as we told you.

But when you think about this issue, I hope for the following: You must evoke the time or historical context in which the First Fatwa was said, which Sheikh Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā said, and scholars gave fatwas by at that time, whom we pointed to at the beginning. These scholars were at that time, the time of occupation of the lands of the Islamic world. Therefore they prohibited it decisively such that they almost had no exception at that time. But there are forms and variables that occurred in the Islamic world. Indeed there are Muslims born in non-Islamic lands; this exists from the reality aspect, because fatwa is with reality now. Born of two English parents, some became Muslim. Look what they did: the one who went to wage Jihad in Iraq, the one who went to Afghanistan, the one who did operations here and there, the one whose loyalty is to Islam and hatred for those who taught and raised him and so on. And these young Palestinian youth born here who never knew Palestine any day; now you find them loving Palestine and defending it.

There are things you touch in reality; there is not necessarily a correlation between one having citizenship and being a disbeliever or the man loving this country. The evidence for that which we found in reality is that many Muslim youth born here, whether from two disbelieving parents and became Muslim or from Muslim parents who came here a century or half a century ago... these second and third generations, Glory be to Allāh, there are those who detached (*insalakha*), and refuge is sought with Allāh, completely, and among them are those who, *mā shā' Allāh*, now spread Islam and Da'wah strongly in the West. But this is not expanded upon. I am speaking about the image not being like this old image; the subject is different now.

Meaning there are forms not taken like this and generalized in this way. It is not necessarily a correlation between one who obtained naturalization or is naturalized or has citizenship... it is not necessary that he loves these people, not necessary that he allies with them, not necessary that he is a disbeliever, meaning and so on. No, the subject requires study and strict controls, and applying the rules of Takfīr and preventers and conditions of Takfīr which we spoke about in such cases. Do not generalize like this.

Personally, when I am asked about that I say: What do you have and why do you work here? He says "I am not persecuted in my country nor otherwise." I say to him: Go to your country, take your children to any

Muslim country if you can. Although I know that these countries are a huge obstacle before these people. Those who want to work or otherwise... go to Gulf countries; obstacles you cannot imagine, they hinder people from the path of Allāh, things are very expensive, and they treat them as foreigners. Who can spend such expenses and go to these countries fundamentally? So they go to countries easier in condition like Egypt for example; they go to Egypt and find it easy. But long ago State Security used to monitor them and sometimes deport them, like some youth who came down to learn in Al-Azhar so they deported him to France again even though he fled from France, so they return him to France again!

Indeed among them are those who went to seek knowledge, so they accused them that they want to go to Palestine and arrested them and deported them also to France. Some they arrested and deported to Britain, and imprisoned them five years. Meaning imagine these criminal governments! People love to depart to Muslim lands but find severe obstacles before them.

So the reality before us and the *Nāzilah* before us differs from the old. People of old, movement was easy and departing was easy and there were no such obstacles, no such complicated travel documents, no such security monitoring in this strict way. Thus, the one giving fatwa in such *Nawāzil* or speaking on issues of Takfīr in these *Nawāzil* must be encompassed with the realistic issue, and Fiqh of Reality and what happens in it of *Nawāzil* and changes. He should not bring me a fatwa of Sheikh Aḥmad Shākir or a fatwa of Sheikh Rashīd Riḍā *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhim jamī'an* and paste it at once like this! No, you must look and research. Perhaps the man is compelled or a refugee or such. Look and speak with him, seek details and inquire: "What keeps you here?" Perhaps he has a hindrance, perhaps such-and-such happened.

We all wish that Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* improves and changes the conditions of Muslims and an Islamic state is established, and migration becomes obligatory on Muslims in this case. But until this case [arises], there is no Islamic state in the Islamic world ruling by Shari'ah. We say to people: Yes, go at least live with Muslims despite their flaws and defects, and despite the complaint of many people about the bad conditions of Muslims, and that they swindle foreigners. In some Arab countries these people go complaining saying "They lie to us and swindle us in money," meaning cheat them. This tires people, and hinders them from the path of Allāh.

So we advise people to go. Even if you cannot live [permanently], work here in such countries as a worker, engineer, trade, or anything, but

make your children, family, and people there studying there. You go work for several months and return, then several months and return. This is better.

I know that some people, *mā shā' Allāh*, among many Muslims living in the West and America now departed to some Arab Islamic states now, I mean Islamic peoples, like Egypt and other states living therein now, for alleviation and obtaining the lowest harms. Even scholars of old said if there is a state with innovation and corruption while it is a Muslim state, and there is a state more just than it and security is available in it, you have the right to migrate to the one more just or less corrupt or less harmful. Even this existed with scholars of old.

Naturally, the subject... I tried to the utmost of what I have to summarize and condense the issue because they are very large scientific researches, studies, PhD theses, and many fatwas but containing very large controversy. I hope I have conveyed the idea to you.

I say this statement of mine and ask Allāh for forgiveness for me and for you.

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Tenth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We praise Him for all good; we thank Him and are not ungrateful to Him. We cast off and forsake those who disobey Him. O Allāh, You alone we worship, to You we pray and prostrate, and towards You we strive and hasten. We hope for Your mercy and fear Your punishment; surely, Your serious punishment will overtake the disbelievers. I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh alone, having no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Honored student brothers, may Allāh bless you. Here we are with the tenth and final lesson among the lessons of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. Our plan in this lecture will be that we will speak about the Evils (Corruptions) resulting from allying with enemies, as if it is a fruit among the fruits of allying with enemies. We will dwell upon a historical overview, *In shā' Allāh*, regarding the erosion of this creedal Loyalty and Disavowal throughout history, and how the State of Islam collapsed until we reached this miserable condition in our present era.

We will speak about the evils mentioned and collected by scholars. Some counted these evils as more than fifty evils, and some twenty evils; everyone exercises Ijtihād. They are very many evils in the life of a Muslim resulting from this alliance with the enemies of Allāh.

Imām Al-Kattānī mentioned these evils in his book *Al-Dawāhī al-Mudhiyyah*, and we will try to choose some of these evils spoken about by scholars, and the effect of these evils resulting from allying with enemies.

The first of these evils: Appearance of the Rites of Kufr.

They said: "Among the first of these evils: Appearance of the rites of Kufr; because the intent of the Lawgiver (*Al-Shāri'*) is that the Word of Islam and the Testimony of Truth be established in their dominance, superior to others, free from disparagement, and free from the appearance of the rites of Kufr over them. Allying with them necessitates inevitably the opposite of that. So this is the greatest rite among the rites of Islam demolished by this alliance. So how can a law-abiding person hesitate or a pious person doubt its prohibition? Rather, it is close to Kufr or it *is* it, or it is a partner to it," as Al-Kattānī says, *raḥimahullāh*.

This is what we notice; rites of Kufr with its mechanisms, systems, laws, and constitutions. People began speaking about Law and Constitution which rule by other than what Allāh has revealed for more than two

hundred years. People speak about them more than Shari'ah. People now understand the Constitution more than they understand Shari'ah! And more than they understand religion. Although it is a game and a great deception. The appearance of the rites of Kufr is apparent in everything; in courts, in judiciary, in legislative councils and Shura councils. *Mā shā' Allāh*, the President of the Republic now, the Memorizer of the Book of Allāh, chose twelve Christians and remnants (*Mafālīl* - from *Fulūl*) and enemies and warriors and hostiles to legislate in this Shura Council, the Legislative Council, a council that will legislate for a specific period, and he chose twelve Christians from them! As if he rewards the Christians for their war against Islam and for their refusal of the presence of any Islamist even if in a distorted or vulgar form!

The second evil among the evils resulting from allying with the enemy: Inclining toward the enemy with leaning, love, and affection.

This is among the definitions of *Muwālāh* naturally as you know. And softness of speech, pleasure, obedience, compromise (*Mudāhanah*), mixing, accompanying, agreeing, descending into his desire, devoting oneself to him, resembling his attire, and glorifying him. All this which you see now; you find the priest with the Sheikh! One cannot distinguish between the two except by the cross. And whoever says: "We all love each other and show affection to each other," by what right?!

One insults the Lord, insults Islam, incites against it, kidnaps believing Muslim women who recently became Muslim, conspires, incites sabotage, and accuses Islamic Shari'ah of being catastrophic and a return to backwardness. Yet despite that, he says to you: "We love each other in Citizenship!" And the common people are lost with this Sheikh and with this dilution and erosion.

The third evil: Being pleased with his rule.

"And among them is being pleased with his rule along with some of them declaring insults against Islam and explicit Kufr." Meaning as Al-Kattānī says: "This one says I am French and this is Crusader (*Ṣalyūbiyyūnī*) —he means Spanish (*Isbānyūlī*)—," even one says "I am British," "I am French," "I am Spanish," "I am English," "I am American." He says it by way of pride. He takes pride over his religion and his Islam. And he is pleased with the rule of these people.

We notice in our Arab countries those who rule by other than Islam, these judges who do not rule by Shari'ah fundamentally... all these judges arrogant on earth do not rule by the Shar‘ nor rule by Islam. These judges who act haughtily are committers of a continuous crime against the right of

Religion and the right of Shar‘, and they need repentance. Despite that, you find these people pleased with their rulings! He is pleased with his legislation; he is pleased that people are ruled by this legislation warring against Allāh.

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَن يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ

"It is not for a believing man or a believing woman, when Allah and His Messenger have decided a matter, that they should [thereafter] have any choice about their affair" [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 36]

People choose over Allāh!

Imagine one in Muslim lands says: "Come let us present to the people: Do they vote for Shari'ah or do they not vote for Shari'ah?! Do they vote for Islam or not!" Are you speaking to people in Alaska or speaking to Muslim people?!

Allāh the Exalted said:

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ ثُمَّ لَا يَجِدُوا فِي أَنفُسِهِمْ حَرَجًا مِّمَّا قَضَيْتَ وَيُسَلِّمُوا تَسْلِيمًا

"But no, by your Lord, they will not [truly] believe until they make you, [O Muhammad], judge concerning that over which they dispute among themselves and then find within themselves no discomfort from what you have judged and submit in [full, willing] submission." [QS. Al-Nisā’: 65]

Are you submissive to these verses and believing in them? How do you present Islam for people's choice?! How is this! "They should not have any choice."

So he is pleased with their rule. He says to you: "The Judiciary is a red line! We respect and revere the Judiciary, and we do not comment on nor critique the rulings!"

We seek refuge in Allāh! There is no critique of the judgment of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā*. As for their judgment, it is false. Glory be to Allāh! They comment on the rulings of Allāh, critique them, deny them, belittle them, and despise them. Then comes a wretched, despicable, bribed judge who entered until he tread this Judiciary via *Wasta* (connections) or via Security or via bribery, yet despite that he rules by other than what

Allāh has revealed, then you say: "The Judiciary is a red line?!" Is he infallible then?!

"No critique of his judgment nor comment upon it." We seek refuge in Allāh! You give him attributes of the Lord *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*. You give attributes of Lordship (*Rubūbiyyah*) to these people?!

People began being pleased with their rule, and this is among the bad effects of this *Muwālāh*: that you are pleased with the rule of this enemy. For the enemy is this Constitution warring against Allāh. The enemy is this Law encroaching upon the right of Allāh, fighting the Quran, and fighting the Sunnah. The one who guards it, the one who rules by it, or the one who legislated it before, and the one who was pleased... all these are pleased with his rule. So this is a great evil resulting from this rule: that you are pleased with the rule of these laws invented for us by Christians, Jews, Crusaders, every Tom, Dick, and Harry, and atheists!

So being pleased with the rule is a great evil among the evils of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*. Therefore scholars have very severe speech on this issue.

Suffice this verse which we said in Sūrah Al-Nisā': "Have you not seen those who claim to have believed in what was revealed to you and what was revealed before you? They wish to refer legislation to Taghut, while they were commanded to reject it; and Satan wishes to lead them far astray. And when it is said to them, 'Come to what Allah has revealed and to the Messenger,' you see the hypocrites turning away from you in aversion." So what evil is greater than these evils?! The evil of being pleased with the rule of these people.

They say: "The Judiciary is towering (*Shāmikh*)!" Towering in falsehood? Towering in Kufr? Towering in Apostasy? Towering in fighting Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* and fighting Shari'ah? How do you tell me towering, and in what thing?

Some judges emerged for you having integrity and patriotism. Yes, according to you with this concept he is good, better than this criminal bribe-taker, but in the ruling of Shari'ah they are equal. This one is pleased with ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed and that one is pleased with ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed. This one rules by this legislation by which he rules while knowing it is contrary to Shari'ah, yet despite that he says to you "The Towering Judiciary" and "The Judiciary that is not rejected"!

Allāh says:

قُلْ إِن كُنتُمْ تُحِبُّونَ اللَّهَ فَاتَّبِعُونِي يُحْبِبْكُمُ اللَّهُ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ

"Say, [O Muhammad], 'If you should love Allah, then follow me, [so] Allah will love you and forgive you your sins.'" [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 31]

If you love Allāh, follow him and do not follow these judges. These judges, it must be announced to them publicly that they must repent a collective repentance and declare their repentance instead of this show! And people sanctify them excessively. Because of whom? Because of the dilution of scholars, because scholars are the ones who paved the way for the *Ummah* and paved the way for the common people that this Judiciary is the fortified fortress! No, the Islamic Judiciary and Shar‘ī Judiciary is the fortified fortress.

Despite that, we have not heard in the judiciary of Muslims nor in the history of Muslims that this judge is infallible! Or that judgment is not rejected nor critiqued! These are terms for which Allāh sent down no authority.

The fourth evil: Incitement to Misguidance and enacting Evil.

As Al-Kattānī says: "Many of those loyal to him did not limit themselves to staining themselves with that, but exceeded to inciting those who did not ally with him towards it and beautifying it for him. As in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* from Abū Hurayrah: 'Whoever calls to misguidance, upon him is a burden of sin like the burdens of those who followed him; that does not decrease anything from their burdens.' And in a Ḥadīth also: 'Whoever enacts in Islam a bad sunnah, upon him is its burden and the burden of whoever acts upon it without decreasing anything from their burdens.'" Imagine one became misguided and did not suffice with his misguidance, and did not suffice that he allied with disbelievers and allied with the enemies of Allāh and loved them and was pleased with them and lived under their wing. No, he incites people to ally with these people, enter into their religion, enter into their obedience, and beautifies it for them as well. This is among the evils because you composed the evil of allying with enemies.

T**he fifth evil is: Helping the enemy and strengthening him.**

And help might be moral or material. How do you help him morally? You defend him and his falsehood and incite people to enter into his alliance, his law, and his legislations. And you strengthen him even materially: you help him with body and defending him, or arm yourself with him and encourage people to join the army of falsehood and defend

these enemies. This is an evil among the evils of allying with enemies. It has many things and forms occurring now. People now are in alliances existing in the world like NATO for example; this Crusader alliance which countries joined like Jordan, Turkey, Pakistan, and some other countries entering into American alliances even if not basic members but entering as services; services for example from the medical aspect or humanitarian aspect as it is said. But they use them as spies and facilitators because they can speak like Muslims and can penetrate these fronts. Turkey is a basic member in NATO which fights Muslims in Afghanistan now. So he strengthens them as well, helps them and strengthens them even though he says they are Muslims.

Also there is an evil subordinate to this evil as well, which is the sixth evil: Increasing the numbers (*Sawād*) of the enemy.

Because when you ally with him, show him loyalty, and enter with him into his army, like these alliances and armies and like what they did in Desert Storm and the First and Second Gulf War alliance and these continuous wars like the war on Afghanistan, very many countries became with America from the Muslims! Even in Iraq in the days of Saddam Hussein, they opened Muslim lands and Muslim territories for the Alliance. So this is called increasing the numbers of these enemies.

The seventh evil is: Entering under his coercion and dominance.

Islam is superior and nothing is superior to it. Now Islam has become in subjection (*Ṣaghār*), humiliation, and at the bottom. Dominance now is for the Americans, dominance now is for the armies of disbelievers and for laws ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed. Even in a state like Egypt for example, the Christians in their entirety do not exceed four million. Despite that, they are the dominant ones. Those imprisoned mostly are the Muslims. The chased clients are the Muslims. They are the controllers of satellite channels, controllers of media and poisoning media, and they have authorities you cannot imagine, although they are a minority and much less than this.

Evidence for that is even in the Election Law which they enter and legislate by other than what Allāh has revealed, they do not succeed despite all these millions; they do not succeed unless they enter into an alliance with these failed, heretical Muslims and worshippers of councils.

The eighth evil: That *Muwālāh* involves separating from the Community (*Jamā'ah*) of Muslims.

When you enter into the community of the enemy, what does it mean? It means you separate from the Community of Muslims and became now in this Party or in this Camp. Because the meaning of inclining to a group is that there is love, pleasure, affection, and love for their way. So this is among the evils of *Muwālāh*.

The ninth evil is: Casting aside Islamic Honor.

And as Al-Kattānī says in their old terminology: "Casting aside Islamic Honor and Imam-ic Obedience," meaning he means the Imam of Muslims and Sultan of Muslims. He says: "And the appearance of Christian Authority over it and its humiliating of it. These are great, destructive atrocities breaking the backs; it is almost Kufr, and refuge is sought with Allāh. Allāh has made Subjection in the depths of the accursed disbelievers as chains and shackles by which they are paraded in regions and in mother cities and metropolises, to show the Honor of Islam and nobility for its Chosen Prophet. So whoever among Muslims attempts to overturn those chains and shackles onto his own neck has opposed Allāh and His Messenger and exposed himself to the wrath of the Mighty, the Compeller, and it is fitting that He throws him on his face with them into the Fire. 'Allah has written, "I will surely overcome, I and My messengers." Indeed, Allah is Powerful and Exalted in Might.'"

This is the beautiful rhymed prose scholars were fond of at that time, although he is close in era to us as well. The point here is the Honor of the Muslim. As for now, one is pleased with the authority of the disbeliever and authority of Christians and interprets for it! Otherwise, these groups appeared that improved and detached from Islam like Qadianism and Baha'ism; all these appeared with the dominance of the Christian British in the Indian Subcontinent at that time. And as happened in Turkey and Iran and elsewhere. And all these groups strengthened by the Crusaders who occupied the lands of the Islamic world.

And also among these evils mentioned by Imām Al-Kattānī: The evil of dividing the word of Muslims and their affair.

It is as in the Ḥadīth: "There will be *Hanāt* and *Hanāt* —meaning tribulations and new matters— which you will disapprove of. Whoever wants to divide the affair of this Ummah while it is united, strike him with the sword whoever he may be." So allying with enemies does this; you divide the gathering of Muslims and scatter their unity by your alliance with the enemies of Islam.

The eleventh evil: Espionage and guiding to the nakedness of Muslims.

We spoke with you naturally on the subject of the ruling on Espionage and the ruling on the Spy when we spoke about the story of the Companion Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'ah in detail. But the point here is that what encourages you to spy on Muslims is this *Muwālāh* for enemies. Because the one loyal to them, mostly they correspond with him and ask him about the conditions of Muslims, and he has taken a favor from their obedience so he has no escape from answering them.

The twelfth evil: Lack of Hatred for the sake of Allāh.

Meaning you say to him: "My brother, this is a Christian, why do you not hate him?" He says to you: "I seek refuge in Allāh! This is my brother and we are all sons of Abraham and we are all one hand and we are sons of a homeland!" We seek refuge in Allāh! Loving for Allāh and Hating for Allāh is among the strongest handholds of Faith. *Al-Walā'* now in the creedal sense and Shar'ī concept has eroded among people and diluted and is almost forgotten now. So these bonds replaced it. "For if he hated for His sake, he would have cast aside His enemies, separated from them, and not allied with them. Loving for Allāh and Hating for Allāh is a great chapter and a principle among principles of Faith."

Therefore, Loving for Allāh, as Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī says in *Qūt al-Qulūb* as Al-Kattānī quoted: "The strongest handhold of Faith is Loving for the sake of Allāh and Hating for His sake. He made that the strongest handhold because it is tied to Faith; Satan cannot untie it nor has he a way over it, just as he has no way over the knot of Faith. Because Allāh *'Azza wa Jalla* intervenes between him and it. And He undertook supporting Faith with a Spirit from Him after writing it in the heart by His mercy. In Loving for Allāh *'Azza wa Jalla* is *Muwālāh* and Support with self, wealth, deed, and speech. And in Hating for Allāh *'Azza wa Jalla* is leaving all that and opposition and separation. So hating the innovator, the open sinner, and the transgressing oppressor; meaning how much more so the disbeliever."

Meaning if hatred is for the innovator and open sinner, then for the disbeliever it is more appropriate.

"And leaving allying with them and supporting them is obligatory upon believers. For that reason, *Muwālāh* for the allies of Allāh *'Azza wa Jalla* and *Mu'ādāh* for His enemies became truly the strongest handhold of Faith. Because you might disobey and oppose your Master due to the empowerment of the enemy and dominance of your desire, except that you hate the sinners and do not ally with them in sins nor love them for their sake." Meaning a human might disobey Allāh but does not love the sinners and hates them and does not try to beautify for them. But this *Muwālāh* makes you ally with them, love them, love their way, and beautify it for

people. So lack of Hatred for Allāh is among the evils resulting from allying with enemies.

Also among evils: Taking lightly all sins.

This is a dangerous subject. Why taking lightly all sins? When a human slips into a sin and puts his foot in it and the second foot, he finds sins easy so he cannot exit. Then he deems them easy and good, and drowns every day in sins and the counter of sins counts. Al-Kattānī says: "And among them is taking lightly all sins. That is because many of those loyal to him, when they saw the evil of their action and what they did, the matter of their religion became easy for them. They took lightly all of them in relation to this great calamity, so they threw themselves into destruction and began falling into atrocious abysses and did not care. That is a sign of Allāh the Exalted turning away from them and the Accursed [Satan] taking them as allies. And whoever he takes as ally, Allāh is not pleased for him with less than Kufr as a replacement whenever he finds a way to it."

People always find sins easy and you find one saying "I am drowning and cannot repent to Allāh!" Although the door of repentance is open even to the one who associated partners. "Say, 'O My servants who have transgressed against themselves [by sinning], do not despair of the mercy of Allah. Indeed, Allah forgives all sins.'"

The fourteenth evil: Sitting with Kufr in utmost humiliation and disgrace.

Al-Kattānī says among them: "Sitting with Kufr in utmost humiliation, disgrace, hatred, expulsion, shame, and loss; judging with utmost blindness of sight and insight, and corruption of conscience, intention, and inner self. Since the enemy sits on an elevated place and the one seeking protection with him is below him, and kisses his hand or knee when coming to him and leaving, and establishes authority over him." He means what was in their days, that some Muslims come to these Christians who occupied Muslim lands and draw near to them, so the Christian sits on a high chair and the Muslim sits lower than him on the ground or on a low chair. And he might drink alcohol in his presence! We saw that, and even here in Muslim lands we know that some people in some parties, some Sheikhs and Muslims are invited, and from protocols like this in parties they serve alcohol. I remember once we were at Oxford University, and I and Sheikh Abū Ḥamzah, may Allāh release him, and a group were there. There was a debate like this and they made a party for us. We looked and there was a large table. We sat and they almost poured alcohol! So we said: "What is this happening while all these beards and Sheikhs are present?!"

They said: "Sorry, we didn't understand." We said: "Our conditions are if we sit, such evils are not placed at all." They said this is their way and the supervisors did not know, even though we alerted them not to put anything of this on the table.

One of the professors told us that there are some Sheikhs who attend and nothing [happens]; he does not drink but alcohol is drunk in front of him and he does not disapprove of him and sits with him like this! We told them prohibited completely, or any foods or anything like it. We are only sitting at the tables conversing until we go to the public place, the place of debate.

The point here is that this happens, and people are lenient in such matters and do not disapprove of evil. He feels he is small! He feels that when he enters upon the disbeliever he is small and the other has higher knowledge than him. He thinks himself an advisor so he remains silent to take what he has. First thing, disapprove the evil against him even! Some of them walk behind him. He says: "And he might walk behind him as is witnessed. That contradicts the covenants of Muslims' honor and elevation of their status, and calls to contempt for the religion, its oppression, insult, and humiliation." The man denounces only that he saw some people walking behind Christians. Meaning some leaders, a governor or minister or official or officer or something, he says walks behind him! This is unprecedented among Muslims. The default is that the Muslim walks first and precedes and is in honor. He is speaking about a miserable state the Islamic world was in between several occupations: Spanish, French, British, Portuguese, and Dutch. The world was divided unfortunately at that time.

The fifteenth evil: Meeting him with what pleases him of good praise.

Welcoming him, greeting him, embracing him as if nothing happened. This makes the other feel he is good and his religion is better than you. This is among the evils of allying with enemies.

The sixteenth evil: Fear of Fitnah in religion.

Because when you ally with this enemy and draw near to him and show affection to him, this is Fitnah in religion and you might deviate (*tamruq*) and exit from the religion.

The seventeenth evil: Humiliation of Muslims and glorification of Christians.

And glorification of disbelievers generally, Christians or Jews or anything. He says: "Humiliation of Muslims and glorification of Christians.

For if they see Muslims coming to them to seek protection with them, they see that they have elevation, sovereignty, and virtue over Muslims. This is prohibited legally and rationally."

Meaning the man screams: How does this happen! Because if the disbeliever sees the Muslim coming to him, humbling himself to him, and seeking protection with him, he feels he is right and has power, elevation, and honor. The proof is that the Muslim is weak and humiliated.

And among the evils also: Disdain and Recklessness.

Meaning he disdains Muslims, disdains the allies of Allāh, and disdains his religion. Also insulting and harming from them. We saw people insulting Islam. Have you seen in the history of Muslims anyone assaulting mosques like what is in Egypt for example?! The maximum was when Napoleon entered Al-Azhar with his horses, and when the Crusaders entered Al-Aqsa Mosque. Always a Crusader member and enemy came with his army, or pagans like the Tatars. But a group in a country where 95% of the country are Muslims, yet they besiege Al-Qā’id Ibrāhīm Mosque in Alexandria and Sheikh Al-Maḥallāwī who is nearing ninety years of age! How do these wretches and this remnant group dare against a House among the Houses of Allāh! This has not happened before. This is from the evils of allying with the enemies of Allāh. People fight the mosque and strike it with bricks, stones, and Molotovs! The world used to rise up when the Governorate assaulted a stair of the stairs of the mosque, or a removal order came for a mosque in a village among villages, the world rises up! The biggest mosque existing in Alexandria and an ancient mosque, yet despite that, in front of this large number of Muslims...

The watchmen of Egypt slept regarding its foxes... so they stuffed themselves and the grape clusters do not vanish!

Unfortunately, chivalry and manhood died! I believe it exists but what shackles it and shackles disciplining these people unfortunately are these trembling and worn-out leaderships. Imagine if these people killed and burned and those in the mosque were killed, more than a hundred fifty or more than that, and Sheikh Al-Maḥallāwī was killed... what is the benefit of this Constitution?! The Messenger of Allāh *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "The demise of the world is lesser with Allāh than killing a Muslim," then you tell me: The Constitution! Let the Constitution go to Hell.

Then after the referendum and these things, will they discipline them? Will they protect the mosques of Allāh?

And the mosques of the Most Merciful, entering them is feared... While all security is in the bars!

Imagine if someone did that in a church, the world would have risen! The Security Council would have intervened and issued a resolution. How is a mosque struck with stones like this and besieged?! This is from the evils of allying with enemies, and from the evils of the erosion of this creedal principle, and from the evils of the erosion of this great doctrine: Loving for Allāh and Hating for Allāh. Resulting from that is this humiliation, laxity, and dilution.

These evils are very many, and we could present more than fifty or sixty evils. I suffice only with some evils. There are other books mentioning many evils, more than eighty evils. But we spoke about the evils mentioned by the scholar Sheikh Al-Kattānī *raḥimahullāh* and dwelt upon them.

I return with you again to the **Historical Overview**. We told you that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* in his battles, the Messenger waged, he and the Companions under his leadership *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* more than sixty military battles between *Ghazwah* (expedition led by him) and *Sariyyah* (expedition sent by him), he and the Companions. Some scholars like Al-Ḥāfiẓ Al-Ḥākim and others, and as Ibn Ḥajar mentioned in *Al-Fatḥ*, counted them as one hundred *Ghazwah* and *Sariyyah*. And in the Ḥadīth: "How many did the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* wage?" as in the Ḥadīth of Zayd b. Arqam.

We told you that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* according to the opinion of scholars after sifting opinions, waged himself about twenty-eight *Ghazwahs*; scholars collected them from here and there. Some calculate major *Ghazwahs* only so they say they are eight major *Ghazwahs* or nine major *Ghazwahs* and the rest are things and skirmishes etc. But the important thing is that this is by collecting all so no one is confused, and these matters are scattered in books of Sīrah.

These *Ghazwahs* collectively, except the *Sariyyah* of Mu'tah in year 8 AH and *Ghazwah* of Tabūk in year 9 AH because they were for the external enemy... as for all these *Ghazwahs*, they were against whom? They were against cousins, maternal uncles, the clan, and against Quraysh. The Meccan fights the Meccan, the Qurashī fights the Qurashī. We did not hear that "The blood of the Qurashī is protected (*Ma'ṣūm*), or the blood of the Madanī is protected —residents of Medina— or the blood of the Meccan is protected!"

It does not exist. Protection (*'Iṣmah*) is only for the people of Islam, for whoever said *Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūl Allāh*; this is the

protection in Islam. As for whoever entered under the power of Islam and rule of Islam, they have rulings of disbelievers, i.e., *Ahl al-Dhimmah* and those who entered under Jizyah or in a truce; these are other issues. But the default is Protection by Islam. Blood is protected by Islam, but there are exceptions and these are also arranged by Shar‘ like truce, Jizyah, and other things.

But the point here is that there is no such thing called "National Unity" (*Luḥmah Waṭaniyyah*) and these loyalties. There is no such thing. Otherwise, the *Ghazwahs* were all against the people of Quraysh among whom the Messenger grew up and was born. The war was upon *them*, and upon his uncles and maternal uncles as we spoke about before.

Therefore Islam purified this internal front by the grace of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* and Sūrah Barā’ah was revealed exposing and disgracing the Fifth Column present in Medina. The first centuries became pure by the grace of Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* in terms of creedal purity, until erosion occurred and ruin occurred after that after the fourth Hijri century. Calamities increased, loyalties [shifted], Rawāfiḍ entered, the internal front was destroyed and torn, and the Islamic world was torn.

Creedal Loyalty opened Andalusia in year 92 AH, and Andalusia collapsed completely and fell in year 897 AH. This was Andalusia in the period of high Creedal Loyalty and loyalty to Shari'ah only and non-erosion of loyalty. But after a period of several centuries, in the fifth Hijri century, the Petty States of Sects (*Duwaylāt al-Ṭawā’if*) appeared to us, then Andalusia was torn. *Duwaylāt al-Ṭawā’if* appeared from year 422 AH to year 487 AH. This is among the blackest eras in the history of Muslims in Andalusia.

The modern era is the one that set a record for *Duwaylāt al-Ṭawā’if* in the Arab world, making this the vilest, meanest, and most ominous bitter era in the history of Islam up to our present time. I have a subject on this matter of *Duwaylāt al-Ṭawā’if* of old, comparing in it between Āl Ṣabāḥ and Āl ‘Abbād in Seville; I spoke about this calamity with which we were burned in our present era.

The Kings of Sects (*Mulūk al-Ṭawā’if*) ruled more than half a century. Andalusia was divided into frail petty states. Look at the effects of lack of Shar‘ī Loyalty, what happened. Almost all of them were paying Jizyah to the Tyrant of Castile, Alfonso VI. Castile is approximately now in the region of Portugal now. Islam was the gatherer of all these races, the Loyalty that gathered them all. When they separated, they began paying Jizyah out of subjection (*Ṣaghār*) to Alfonso VI.

They also divided into many divisions, and each one thought himself Commander of the Faithful (*Amīr al-Mu'minīn*). They became petty states; this one *Amīr al-Mu'minīn* Al-Mu'taṣim b. Ṣumādiḥ, the Petty State of Banū Hūd in Zaragoza, Petty State of Banū Dhī al-Nūn in Toledo, Petty State of Banū Zīrī in Granada, Petty State of Banū al-Afṭas in Badajoz, Petty State of Banū al-'Abbād in Seville. These petty states were merely fortresses like this. They adopted appearances of pomp and grandeur of major states and imitated the Umayyad Caliphate and Abbasid Caliphate and even the Prime Ministry at that time. They imitated Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphs despite the vast distance between the soil and the Pleiades. Ibn Rashīq al-Qayrawānī described their state saying:

What makes me ascetic regarding the land of Andalusia... are titles of Mu'tamid therein and Mu'taḍid! Titles of kingdom in other than their place... Like the cat imitating the lion's attack by puffing up!

Andalusia was going to become a toy in the hand of this Crusader Alfonso were it not for the grace of Allāh that Ibn Tāshfīn eliminated the *Duwaylāt al-Ṭawā'if* and returned them and renewed the youth of Islam once again for more than two centuries by the hands of the Murābiṭūn.

The point here is the erosion of a bitter era described by Ibn Ḥazm because he was contemporary to a period of the periods of *Duwaylāt al-Ṭawā'if*; he lived in this period and has a book *Al-Talkhīṣ li-Wujūh al-Takhlīṣ*. He said: "As for this time of ours —meaning in the fifth Hijri century— and these lands of ours, it is but a door: close your eyes and strike with your hands, and yours is what you gather; either a fruit or a burning coal." He spoke with very severe words, but in the end he says about humiliation and disgrace: "As for today, it is but Jizyah on the heads of Muslims; they call it *Al-Qaṭī'* (The Herd/Flock Tax). They pay it monthly. And a tax on their wealth of sheep, cows, beasts, and bees. It is levied on everything sold in markets, and on permitting the sale of alcohol by Muslims in some lands. This is all that the dominators seize today, he means Christians in Andalusia. This is tearing of veils, breaking of the laws of Islam, untying its knots knot by knot, inventing a new religion, and abandoning Allāh *'Azza wa Jalla*. By Allāh, if they knew, meaning the rulers at that time, that in worshiping crosses was the facilitation of their affairs, they would have hastened to it. We see them seeking help from the Christians, enabling them over the harems of Muslims, their sons, and their men, carrying them as captives to the lands of Christians. Perhaps they protect them from the inviolable land and crowd them with them securely. And perhaps they gave them cities and fortresses." This period is witnessed by Ibn Ḥazm *raḥimahullāh*. Ibn Ḥazm died in year 456 AH, telling about the first period in the days of the States of Sects: "And perhaps they gave

them cities and fortresses willingly, so they emptied them of Islam and populated them with church bells. May Allāh curse all of them and unleash upon them a sword of His swords." This is the speech of Imām Ibn Ḥazm, an eyewitness to the crime of the alliance of Muslim rulers with Alfonso and the Crusaders at that time. The matter reached them that they sell alcohol for the benefit of Christians! They take children of Muslims and hand them to Christians to sell them. Some of them take fortresses and cities with their Muslims and hand them to Christians. Humiliation beyond humiliation due to the erosion of Loyalty. When Loyalty became to other than Allāh, look what happened; Andalusia was lost later.

This Andalusia is a sad elegy as the poet says: *Then those years passed... and their people, as if it and they were dreams.*

The Abbasid State also, which populated the world and inherited the Umayyad State. Look at the creedal erosion in the killing of Caliph Al-Mutawakkil ‘alā Allāh in year 247 AH. Islam was strong and honored until the reign of Caliph Al-Mutawakkil. After the Caliph, the operation became in utmost deterioration as it is said, and commanders began manipulating the Caliph: *A Caliph in a cage between Waṣīf and Bughā... He says what they said to him as the parrot says.*

Meaning the Caliph became a toy at that time. But there was laxity from the Caliph before him and some looseness in the state apparatus. The Shī‘ah had reached power at that time, and Ibn Abī Du’ād had corrupted, and the Mu‘tazilah gave the Shī‘ah what they wanted. So this erosion happened until Caliph Al-Mutawakkil came and supported Ahl al-Sunnah, so they conspired against him. Afterward, all the hidden was revealed and it became clear that the Shī‘ah and some commanders loyal to the Rāfiḍī Shī‘ah at that time were able to whisper into the mind of the Caliph's son. He was penetrated by the Shī‘ah who poisoned his thoughts and corrupted his creed, pushing him to take revenge on his father claiming that his father wanted to appoint his brother Al-Mu‘tazz instead of him. Hence we find this Caliph, unfortunately, who did not enjoy his rule. The first Caliph to kill his father among Muslims at that time was the son of Caliph Al-Mutawakkil, the killer of his father. This is what his father built after eliminating innovations, eliminating all these polytheistic practices that existed, and imposing Jizyah on Christians. So they all hated Caliph Al-Mutawakkil.

Caliph Al-Mutawakkil was able within a period to purify the internal front, although he was fighting on the external front as well, blocking frontiers and defending the egg (*Bayḍah* - heartland) of Islam.

Despite that, the Caliph's project was uniting the internal front and eliminating the Fifth Column.

Contrary to what people do today, saying "The important thing is the internal front!" You put a Trinitarian Christian or Communist or Atheist or with worshippers of Homeland or worshippers of Nationalism and Idols together with the Monotheist?! How do you tell me all these are one front?! This is corruption itself. Look at Caliph Al-Mutawakkil, what he did in the front of this great Abbasid Caliphate state. He fought the internal front and purified it from these filths. The weevil was gnawing in this state at that time, so he was able to eradicate the root of these people in a certain period as much as possible. But because the Fifth Column existing at that time reached the Court or reached the Caliph's house via his son, here they whispered to him via some commanders and caught the Caliph unawares and killed him. Because it is safety; your son enters upon you, does the guard search him for example?!

So they entered and conspired against Caliph Al-Mutawakkil *raḥimahullāh* and the Caliph was killed. Then no Caliph enjoyed [rule] after the second era of the Abbasid State at that time due to this calamitous Loyalty, due to the negligence of these people. You brought a group of polytheists and grave-worshippers and a group of those loyal to the enemies of Allāh and put them in the state! So they conspired against it, then the era of Caliphs began to erode until we reached the slaughter of Caliph Al-Musta'ṣim centuries later, in year 656 [AH] at the hands of Hulagu.

Although unfortunately he did not listen to his advisors nor his brothers but unfortunately empowered Ibn al-'Alqamī. A sad elegy done by Caliph Al-Musta'ṣim Billāh and it was a great massacre. Ibn al-'Alqamī about whom Imām Al-Dhahabī said: "Ibn al-'Alqamī the Baghdadi, the Rāfiḍī, the Wazir of Al-Musta'ṣim. His state was fourteen years; he spread Rafḍ (Shī'ism), so the Sunnah opposed him and crowds bullied. It was narrated that he knew Hulagu intended Iraq, so he corresponded with him, emboldened him, and strengthened his resolve to intend Iraq."

And the tragedy happened and the Caliph was killed and those with him of the virtuous and notables, until he eulogized them: Baghdad was ruined and its people killed. Until their poet said: *It perished and its people together... For their houses, with the survival of our Master the Wazir, are ruins.*

He means Ibn al-'Alqamī.

And another said: *O band of Islam, wail and mourn... In grief for what happened to Al-Musta‘ṣim. The seat of Ministry was before his time... for Ibn al-Furāt, then became for Ibn al-‘Alqamī.*

Naturally people wept and it was a massacre. People imagined the Resurrection had started when Caliph Al-Musta‘ṣim Al-‘Abbāsī was slaughtered, unfortunately, *raḥimahullāh*.

It eroded due to what? Loyalty. You allied with Rawāfiḍ, allied with enemies of Islam, allied with enemies of Companions, and allied with those who impugn the best of the Ummah and impugn even the Holy Quran. How do you bring them near and make a Wazir remain in rule for fourteen years! This is a calamity.

Naturally at that time also appeared in the far Maghrib the State of the Murābiṭūn. Before this subject in the Maghrib region, Ibn Tūmart the Dajjāl (Imposter) laughed at people and created a subject of asceticism and eliminated the State of the Murābiṭūn. The Murābiṭūn state was a Sunni state.

But this criminal imposter Ibn Tūmart corrupted [matters] for Muslims and caused their slaughter. This Ibn Tūmart died in year 534 AH and was basically in this innovated State of Al-Muwaḥḥidūn. They fought the people of Islam, fought the [true] Monotheists, and killed thousands of scholars. Although they entered Andalusia, they lost it later unfortunately and the state was lost. Afterwards, the State of Andalusia receded into Granada and ended as if it had not been yesterday!

Also appeared at that time, after the sun of Islam eclipsed in Andalusia, the Ottoman State from year 699 AH to year 1432 AH[1]. It was very strong, but unfortunately the backbone that caused the exhaustion of the state was Loyalty to these gangs and these protrusions that were conspiring against the people of Islam. There were Jewish gangs, and gangs of Christians and Crusaders, and Capitulatons (*Imtiyāzāt*), and Caliphs marrying these Christian and Roman women and increasing them, and increasing eunuchs and slave girls. Entry of all these... they inclined to their religion in the end and conspired. They are many reasons; not eunuchs nor loyalty to Roman women only, the subject is not like this. There were big things.

They appointed as Wazirs people who were Christians then entered Islam. Laxity occurred and innovations, Sufism, and grave-worship spread among them. Loyalties became worn out. Although it is a state that lasted six centuries, unfortunately it wore out and the matter reached with the state

[1] Meant 1342 AH/1924 CE.

in the end that it was torn severely. Despite its strong conquests even entering the borders of Italy and almost all the Eastern Europe region and Greece. More than seventy percent before World War I belonged to Muslims. Most of the people were Muslim in Greece. Now search for Muslims in Greece; you find them a trace after an eye (non-existent). All this due to abandoning Loyalty, the bond that made this Islam strong and spreading.

Therefore the Rightly Guided Caliphs then the Umayyad State were due to this Creedal Loyalty in that single first century; it is what made this bond one, one Caliph, no tearing. Then after that when it eroded and self-desire and other things appeared, the Islamic State was torn later.

Sultan Bayezid I who died in year 804 AH was killed, *raḥimahullāh*. He defeated the Europeans entirely. Imagine he defeated the Europeans entirely in the Battle of Nicopolis at that time or two years before it. Look how his fate was after that. This Sultan who terrified the Europeans when he besieged Constantinople and almost opened it and almost swept Europe entirely and defeated them a great defeat. Suddenly he sees that Tamerlane the Tatar, the Shī'ī, the criminal, the shedder of blood... suddenly he allies with the kings of Europe and strikes the Islamic State from behind. So he is forced to return to him. Some soldiers who were in the army at that time from the Shī'ah abandoned him. Suddenly they leave the army and flee from him. So Sultan Bayezid faces Tamerlane's army alone, and suddenly he is captured and humiliated. And people wept for him in the Two Holy Mosques and he has letters.

This criminal Tamerlane humiliated him, who did these deeds. Even Will Durant speaks about the Battle of Nicopolis and says: "The two ablest commanders of their time clashed at Ankara in 1401 [1402]. Timur's strategy compelled his Turkish enemies to fight after he had exhausted them and worn out their strength by long marching. He defeated the Turks a denying defeat and took Bayezid prisoner. Constantinople rejoiced", because Constantinople was in the hands of the Christians of Europe at that time before it fell, "and Christendom remained safe from the Turks for half a century thanks to the Tatars." He means thanks to the Tatars, i.e., the Shī'ah Tatars led by Tamerlane who became Shī'ī, this criminal, and was in alliance with Christians. Loyalty; due to this leniency they eroded.

On the contrary, the West sent congratulatory letters. "Henry IV King of England sent him congratulations. France also dispatched a bishop carrying gifts. Henry III King of Castile dispatched a famous mission headed by Ruy González de Clavijo." This Clavijo sent him a mission and

gifts from the Kings of England, France, and Castile in Portugal at that time, all congratulating Tamerlane because he defeated Bayezid.

You tell me National Unity! They allied with Christians. And the Shī‘ah fought no one but the people of Islam. What caused the elimination of the Ottoman State was these Shī‘ah and they allied with it [enemies]. The Safavid State, this superstitious state which was Sufism and nonsense, turned into Shī‘ah and fought Islam and they are the ones who exhausted the Ottoman State.

Also notice in the modern era there is a battle in Egypt called the Battle of Tel El Kebir. It was in year 1299 AH [1882 CE]. This battle was between the Egyptian and English army. Imagine! Chaos, clowning, loyalty, and traitors. Meaning people betrayed Ahmed Urabi the leader at that time, from his companions. People had loyalty to the English and informed on him. Khenfes Pasha and others. It was a mockery happened in this period. It was all loyalties and informings, and it was a group of those who allied with enemies and they are the ones who reported on Ahmed Urabi and caused his failure.

For example in Afghanistan year 2001, Taliban. Who caused the entry with this ease? The Northern Alliance. The Northern Alliance composed of Rabbani, Massoud, and a group... these were Muslims and were Mujahideen. They allied with all enemies; Dostum the Communist and others. But the alliance of these: Professor Rabbani, Massoud, Mohammed Fahim, Abdullah Abdullah and others, all these allied with the Americans and came on an American tank and killed and caused the killing of more than half a million until now due to their presence, from the poor Afghan people, in order to fight Taliban which was raising the banner of Shari'ah. They allied with enemies, fought, were in their army, and they were the ones guiding them and are consultants with them until now. The Taliban state vanished due to this treachery, due to this vileness, and due to this loyalty to the enemies of Allāh.

Even in Iraq, the Capital of Al-Rashid went. Although they are Baath and criminals and caused war on Islam, but who allied with them [invaders]? These Rāfiḍī Shī‘ah and Mullahs of Qom and Ayatollahs (Ayat of Satan) allied with them. Then also allied with them these defeated ones from the followers of the Muslim Brotherhood; Tariq Al-Hashimi, Hajib Hosni, Salah al-Din Bahaa al-Din's party, and all these from Ikhwān and Sahwa and others. All these allied with the invading American armies to fight Islam, Muslims, and the Islamic people, especially Ahl al-Sunnah there. All these wars now happened due to this erosion.

And the last thing was in Somalia. Who encouraged Ethiopia? African states. And states like the State of Āl Sa'ūd and Egypt encouraged it. They were the ones allied with them and encouraged them to strike and occupy Somalia from the Mujahideen youth, and they are the ones fighting them now. Meaning Ethiopia became the ally for these. And now it is the encourager; Kenya is encouraged by Islamic states and given money from Gulf states and states of Āl Sa'ūd to war against and besiege Islam in Africa and besiege Islam in Somalia.

Now who allies and shows loyalty to enemies in Mali and Azawad? These coming days, *In shā' Allāh*, you will find the Security Council resolution launching a siege, strike, justification, and legitimization of fighting the Mujahideen in the Azawad region or the Islamic State of Azawad which is in Northern Mali. Who allies against whom? The Algerian government, Algerian army, Mauritanian army, and Senegal army. All these are Muslim countries and Muslim peoples! Their loyalty is to the French, their loyalty is to the Americans. They besiege Muslims who say "Our Lord is Allāh."

And to tear them from within (The Internal Front). They ally with Sufism and bribe Sufis and grave-worshippers against monotheist Muslims. And they bribe some national parties like the Azawad Movement; this is a secular movement as well, they make it fight these Muslims and tear them apart. This is from the evils and destruction of allying with the enemies of Allāh.

Lest I prolong more than this, these are the evils we spoke about and they are many evils and still follow in succession (*tatrā*) unfortunately. Here we have finished the tenth lesson of the lessons of the course "Loyalty and Disavowal." We ask Allāh *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* to benefit by it. We tried as much as possible to summarize and be brief; otherwise, the subject of *Walā'* is large and has very many subjects requiring details, but we suffice with this amount.

There remains only that I point to the subject of the Exam:

The exam, *In shā' Allāh*, will be oral. You only have to review from the introduction to the end. We will not enter, as I usually say, into details. Meaning I will not say to you "Mention to me when So-and-so was born or when So-and-so died." No, we are speaking about the basics of the subject of *Al-Walā' wa al-Barā'*.

Whoever is ready should inform us, and we will hold an oral exam for him. Whether for men or women. A woman... it is permissible for any woman that we hold an exam for her, being for example in her house with

a *Maḥram* (her brother or any of her *Maḥrams*) and we speak with her *In shā' Allāh*. If she does not have a *Maḥram,* we will bring some Sheikhs to be with us as witnesses to the dialogue and I conduct the exam for her.

May Allāh bless you, and may Allāh reward you with all good.

Al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.